

S. 4191. An act to maintain existing minimum postage rates on certain publications mailed for delivery within the county of publication;

S. 4287. An act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, relating to detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 8-14, 1959, as National Children's Dental Health Week;

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to approve the report of the Department of the Interior on Red Willow Dam and Reservoir in Nebraska; and

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to authorize the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a motion to adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow. The Senate has agreed to amendments to the bill. There will be thorough and extensive debate. We are all aware of that fact. It is 11:30 in the evening. I think Members are ready to go home. If the Senator will yield, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senator be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And I shall move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the record clear that there is now pending a motion to recommit?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. The record is clear. If it is not clear it can be made clear tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. CARROLL. So long as the motion is now pending, I have no objection.

Mr. JENNER, Mr. McCLELLAN and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The motion is not debatable. I move the Senate adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate adjourn. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I asked for recognition before the motion was made. I was yelling at the Chair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I was trying to obtain recognition.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator withdraw his motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I will not withdraw the motion.

Mr. JENNER and several other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate ad-

journ. On this question the yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAINÉ] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 18, not voting 8, as follows:

YEAS—70

Aiken	Hill	Morton
Anderson	Hoblitzell	Murray
Barrett	Humphrey	Neuberger
Beall	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Javits	Pastore
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Capehart	Jordan	Purtell
Carroll	Kefauver	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Church	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Yarborough
Green	McNamara	Young
Hennings	Monroney	
Hickenlooper	Morse	

NAYS—18

Allott	Curtis	Mundt
Bricker	Dworshak	Revercomb
Bridges	Ervin	Robertson
Butler	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Byrd	Jenner	Thurmond
Cotton	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—8

Carlson	Hayden	Ives
Flanders	Holland	Payne
Frear	Hruska	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 21, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 20, 1958:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, a Foreign Service Officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Arthur H. Underwood, the Church of St. Timothy, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who alone dost govern the minds and hearts of men, make us deeply conscious of Thy presence in our midst as again we meet to take counsel together for the work Thou hast committed to our care. To Thy loving wisdom and mercy we commend our Nation. Grant, we beseech Thee, to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and to all in authority, wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will. Fill us with the love of truth and righteousness; and make us ever mindful of our calling to serve this people in Thy faith and fear. In the press of demands too great for man unaided by Thy grace, may we ever hear Thy quiet voice within speaking to us the words of truth, power, and salvation. As Thy children, may we lay aside all that divides and sets a man against his brother, that so, in unity of heart and spirit, we may bravely and gladly bear the burdens of this hour.

Finally, we commend to Thy gracious care and keeping the distressed peoples of all lands, that of Thy mercy they may find strength to endure their trials and wisdom to work out the ways of understanding and of peace; all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterle;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo E. Miller;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzgar;

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 7720. An act for the relief of Viola Belger;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kiiko Nemoto;

H. R. 11009. An act to provide for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12207. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alto Ross and children and for E. B. Ard and his daughter, Mrs. Joan Ard Nichols;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anne-liese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson Company, and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. Con. Res. 380. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make changes in the enrollment of H. R. 13132.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House

is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11477. An act to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9147) entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3502. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 4021. An act to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chat-tahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins, and intervening areas;

S. 4053. An act to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 4196. An act to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (47 Stat. 1425), as amended, to authorize incorporation of contract terms by reference in short-form documents.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CIVIL CASES

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.

MINERALS SUBSIDY

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, here in the closing days of August when we all should and could have long since been back in our Districts, we are still discovering and creating new crises which demand the immediate action of this Congress.

We have been told that we face the total destruction of some segment of our national economy, national defense, and in some instances even our national survival as these various bills come to us in these waning days.

And here again we have been told that we have the alternative of another subsidy program or catastrophe.

All technical phases of the program today have been pretty well mulled over.

As far as stockpile figures are concerned, we have had a sufficient variation and conflict of figures in the debate thus far to justify any position one might choose to take either for or against this bill.

But I can't for the life of me figure out why all of this vital emergency legislation, none of which can hold a few months until the 86th Congress convenes, comes in the last minute logjam of this 2-year session, which, coincidentally, is an election year.

To contend there are no real problems in the domestic mining industry and particularly in the production of copper, lead, zinc, flourspar and tungsten would admittedly be ridiculous.

But this legislation is the easy way out and it is neither a sound or permanent solution to the problem.

I repeat, as I did during the discussion on the rule, that it is a problem for the Tariff Commission and this legislation is just another case where the cure, such as it is, is far worse than the disease itself.

If you have any doubt about the preference of the solution to the problem, may I suggest that you read the testimony given by the folks in the mining industry before our committee.

And I might suggest that if there is any further doubt as to the solution, you might read the report sent up a few days ago from the Secretary of the Interior—but read between the lines, too.

Just 3 weeks ago, on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Arkansas, the very distinguished and astute chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, admonished us of the grave inflationary dangers of our deficit spending.

Never was there a more serious warning presented in a more sincere manner.

If you looked around the floor that day, you would have observed a feeling of solemn realization of this warning on both sides of the aisle as Mr. MILLS spoke.

But before the echo of these words died out, we were back pumping more gas into a balloon that will literally burst before it can possibly descend.

It should be pointed out too that this bill creates a positive threat that the entire mineral industry might well become subservient to the Secretary of the Interior in the years ahead.

Further than that, we are swinging the door wide open to another Federal subsidy program that 5 years from now will either demand an extension or the industry itself may find itself in worse shape than it is today.

But let's not labor under any illusion that this program will end in 5 years.

Right now the taxpayers of this country are laden with no less than 71

Federal subsidy programs passed as temporary or limited emergency measures, and 65 of these have grown rather than shrunk.

All of these Federal subsidy babies wear a size 12 shoe before they are old enough to be spanked.

Those of us who deal in practical politics know, too, that it is invariably political suicide to halt or even reduce any Federal subsidy program.

On the other hand it is generally a real political temptation to increase these programs, especially when election years roll around.

I contend that we are setting a dangerous precedent, one that can reach far beyond the domestic mining industry.

If this program is adopted, how can Congress refuse subsidy payments to any industry that claims it is in economic difficulty?

Well, I suppose it is useless to talk in terms of setting dangerous precedents.

The fact that we are as a nation \$288 billion in debt apparently does not seem to make too much difference in what we have done here in recent weeks.

If we keep this up with legislation like we have before us today, we'll face a real crisis, perhaps sooner than we think.

There are solutions to many of these problems that don't have a billion-dollar price tag on them and we had better start taking some other road than deficit spending before it is too late.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12858) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2670)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12858) "making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 11, 13, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,188,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$603,246,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$113,370,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$68,347,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,556,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,831,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$146,015,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,039,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 12, 17 and 18.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN MCCLELLAN,
WILLIS ROBERTSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ROBT. S. KERR,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12858), making appropriations for Civil Functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Rivers and harbors and flood control

General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$10,188,500 instead of \$8,613,500 as proposed by the House and \$11,485,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure is distributed as follows:

Navigation studies.....	\$300,000
Flood-control studies.....	850,000
Beach erosion cooperative studies.....	10,000
Ohio River Basin study.....	156,000
Great Lakes Harbor survey.....	15,000
Colorado River, Texas.....	50,000
Trinity River, Texas.....	100,000
Stream gauging.....	28,000
Precipitation studies.....	66,000

Total..... 1,575,000

Construction, General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$603,246,500 instead of \$578,455,500 as proposed by the House and \$630,371,500 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that funds appropriated under this item shall be allocated as set forth in the following tabulation:

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:					Arizona:				
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia.....			\$600,000		Gila River channel improvement.....				\$60,000
Dauphin Island Bay.....			(1)		Painted Rock Reservoir.....	\$7,000,000		\$7,000,000	
Jackson lock and dam.....	\$6,000,000		6,000,000		Whitlow Ranch Reservoir.....	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia.....	11,700,000		11,700,000		Arkansas:				
Alaska:					Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies).....		\$900,000		900,000
Dry Pass.....	846,000		846,000		Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (emergency bank stabilization and channel rectification).....	541,000		2,541,000	
Gastineau Channel.....			1,100,000						
Neva and Olga Straits.....			(1)						

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Arkansas—Continued					Hawaii:				
Beaver Reservoir		\$250,000		\$750,000	Hanapepe River			\$407,000	
Bull shoals Reservoir, Ark., and Mo. (additions of units Nos. 5 and 6)	\$500,000		500,000		Honolulu Harbor		\$58,000	1,000,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam	2,500,000		2,500,000		Kawailae Harbor	\$1,352,000		1,352,000	
Greers Ferry Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000		Idaho:				
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex.			300,000		Columbia River, local protection:				
Millwood Reservoir (modification)				\$150,000	a—Blackfoot River				\$46,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	400,000		400,000		b—Boise Valley				24,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)					c—Hesse Roberts extension			(1)	5,500
Walnut Bayou	575,000		575,000		d—Lightning Creek			58,000	
California:					Little Wood River				
Black Butte Reservoir			500,000		Illinois:				
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel	1,800,000		1,800,000		Carlyle Reservoir	800,000		800,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	800,000		800,000		Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R.R. bridge, including channel change			500,000	
Eel River			370,000		Cleer Creek Drainage and Levee District	236,000		236,000	
Half Moon Bay			1,200,000		Drury Drainage District				80,000
Hogan Reservoir				230,000	East St. Louis and vicinity	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	18,500,000		18,500,000		Henderson River (diversion unit)				117,000
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel, pt. I	8,500,000		8,500,000	
Middle Creek	600,000		600,000		Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Mill Creek levees		32,000		32,000	Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Rectification of damages	65,000		65,000	
Playa Del Rey Inlet and Basin	1,200,000		1,200,000		Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri (lock and dam 27)			1,000,000	
Port Hueneme Harbor (excludes cost to U. S. Navy)			840,000		The Sny Basin			500,000	
Russian River Reservoir	750,000		750,000		Wabash R. R. bridges at Mercedosa and Valley City	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Sacramento River	3,000,000		3,000,000		Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie duPont Drainage and Levee Districts	400,000		400,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		Wood River Drainage and Levee District	800,000		800,000	
Sacramento River deepwater ship channel	6,000,000		6,000,000		Indiana:				
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	2,000,000		2,000,000		Evansville			200,000	
San Diego River and Mission Bay	876,000		876,000		Lock and dam 41, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)				
San Francisco Harbor:					Mansfield Reservoir	3,400,000		3,400,000	
a—Removal of shoals and rocks and 45-foot main ship channel			20,000		Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				25,000
b—50-foot main ship channel and Black Point Shoal channel			285,000		Monroe Reservoir			235,000	
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek		110,000		110,000	Vincennes				
San Joaquin River Stockton deepwater channel	700,000		700,000		Iowa:				
San Lorenzo Creek	1,800,000		1,800,000		Floyd River and tributaries				150,000
San Lorenzo River	2,300,000		2,300,000		Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16		150,000		150,000
Santa Clara River		60,000	460,000		Little Sioux River	2,700,000		2,700,000	
Santa Cruz Harbor				75,000	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	3,500,000		2,500,000	
Santa Maria Valley levees		115,000	500,000	30,000	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
Stewart Canyon Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000		a—Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.	5,700,000		5,700,000	
Success Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		b—Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	3,300,000		3,300,000	
Terminus Reservoir					c—Kansas City to the mouth	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)					Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, including Miners Bend. (See Nebraska.)				
Tuolumne River reservoirs (New Don Pedro)				15,000	Muscatine	226,000		226,000	
Connecticut:					Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine Louisa County Drainage District No. 13		175,000	390,000	175,000
Thomaston Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		Red Rock Reservoir				
Delaware:					Kansas:				
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.:					Abilene	200,000		200,000	
a—Summit Bridge	2,940,000		2,940,000		John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir			400,000	
b—Canal improvement				180,000	Manhattan		180,000	300,000	180,000
Florida:					Millford Reservoir				
Central and southern Florida	7,500,000		6,500,000		Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)				
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River				135,000	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)				
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	1,100,000		1,100,000		Ottawa	950,000		950,000	
Port Everglades Harbor				28,000	Perry Reservoir		125,000		125,000
St. Joseph Bay, Port St. Joe Harbor			573,000		Pomona Reservoir			800,000	
Tampa Harbor:					Salina	900,000		900,000	
a—34-foot channel	2,950,000		2,950,000		Topeka	2,700,000		2,700,000	
b—Hillsboro River			(1)		Toronto Reservoir	2,400,000		2,400,000	
Water-hyacinth obstruction in the waters of the Gulf and South Atlantic States, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas. (See Louisiana.)					Tuttle Creek Reservoir	15,400,000		15,400,000	
Georgia:					Wilson Reservoir		175,000		175,000
Brunswick Harbor (deferred for restudy)			168,000		Kentucky:				
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)					Barkley Dam (lower Cumberland lock and dam), Ky. and Tenn.	10,500,000		10,500,000	
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	15,500,000		15,500,000		Buckhorn Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Savannah River below Augusta	700,000		700,000		Catlettsburg	642,000		642,000	
Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)									

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Kentucky—Continued					Missouri—Continued				
Fishtrap Reservoir				\$140,000	Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri (lock and dam 27). (See Illinois.)				
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	\$11,000,000		\$11,000,000		Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Lock and dam 41, Indiana and Kentucky	6,000,000		6,000,000		Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)				
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	11,000,000		11,000,000		Pomme de Terre Reservoir	\$3,400,000		\$3,400,000	
New Richmond locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	4,000,000	\$120,000	4,000,000	120,000	St. Louis			1,700,000	
No. 2 Barren Reservoir			500,000		Stockton Reservoir				\$150,000
Nolin Reservoir					Tablo Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	12,400,000		12,400,000	
Rough River Reservoir and channels	3,300,000		3,300,000		Montana:				
Louisiana:					Columbia River local protection:				
Amite River and tributaries	725,000		1,000,000		Clark Fork at Missoula		\$12,000		12,000
Barataria Bay Waterway			58,000		b—St. Regis River			(1)	
Chefunte River and Bogue Falls			(1)		Fort Peck Dam (2d powerplant)	6,500,000		6,500,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	6,500,000		6,500,000		Nebraska:				
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico			150,000		Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)				
Mississippi River Gulf Outlet	3,500,000		4,000,000		Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (Deferred for re-study)				100,000	Missouri River (Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak.	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Red River levees below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)					Nevada:				
Water hyacinth obstructions in the waters of the Gulf and South Atlantic States, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas			300,000		Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada			150,000	
Maine:			(1)		New Hampshire:				
Josias River (modification)					Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir	1,400,000		1,500,000	
Maryland:					Otter Brook Reservoir	320,000		320,000	
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	1,751,000		1,751,000		New Jersey:				
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay. (See Delaware.)					Delaware River (Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton), Pa. and N. J.	13,000,000		13,000,000	
Massachusetts:					New York and New Jersey Channels, N. Y. and N. J.	5,420,000		5,420,000	
Boston Harbor extension to 40-foot anchorage	2,100,000		2,100,000		Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
East Brimfield Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000		New Mexico:				
Hodges Village Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000		Albuquerque	1,250,000		1,250,000	
Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts. (See Rhode Island.)					Carlsbad	775,000		775,000	
New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet				460,000	Los Esteros-Alamogordo Reservoirs		90,000		90,000
North Adams	4,500,000		4,500,000		Rio Grande Floodway, Cochiti to Rio Puerco				50,000
Salem Harbor			1,320,000		Socorro				45,000
West Hill Reservoir			275,000		New York:				
Westville Reservoir		141,000		141,000	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N. Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Weymouth Fore River	800,000		800,000		Barcelona Harbor	200,000		200,000	
Worcester	2,534,000		2,534,000		Buffalo Harbor, north entrance	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Michigan:					Endicott Johnson City and Vestal	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Battle Creek	1,200,000		1,200,000		Fire Island Inlet				880,000
Big Bay Harbor			342,000		Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	110,000		910,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels	23,500,000		25,500,000		Irondequoit Bay			120,000	
Harrisville Harbor	700,000		700,000		New York and New Jersey Channels, N. Y. and N. J. (See New Jersey.)				
Houghton-Hancock Bridge	1,300,000		1,300,000		Oswego Harbor detached breakwaters	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Little Lake Harbor			30,000		Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York and New Jersey	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Manistique Harbor	338,000		338,000		North Carolina:				
New Poe lock			350,000		Beaufort Harbor			(1)	
Port Austin Harbor	613,000		613,000		Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay			(1)	
Saginaw River	800,000		800,000		Oregon Inlet (12-foot channel to Manteo and Wanchese only)			722,000	
St. Marys River, improvement of south canal	2,000,000		2,000,000		Wilkesboro Reservoir		125,000		125,000
Whitfish Point Harbor	541,000		541,000		North Dakota:				
Minnesota:					Garrison Reservoir	10,600,000		10,600,000	
Grand Marais Harbor			(1)		Lower Heart River	500,000		500,000	
Lost River and Ruffy Brook			128,000		Red River of the North, Minn., and N. Dak. (See Minnesota.)				
Mankato and North Mankato				55,000	Ohio:				
Minnesota River navigation				33,000	Ashtabula Harbor	997,000		997,000	
Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul				200,000	Dillon Reservoir	8,250,000		8,250,000	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., rectification of damages. (See Illinois.)					Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak.	500,000		500,000		Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)				
St. Anthony Falls	1,100,000		1,100,000		New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia	10,000,000		10,000,000	
Missouri:									
Bear Creek Reservoir			300,000						
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)									
Canton	100,000		100,000						
Cape Girardeau (reach No. 2 only)	1,500,000		1,500,000						
Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1				100,000					
Fabius River Drainage District			750,000						
Joanna Reservoir				50,000					
Kasinger Bluff Reservoir				80,000					
Mississippi River between Ohio River and Missouri River, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)									

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Ohio—Continued					Tennessee:				
New Richmond lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)					Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		\$250,000	\$1,000,000		Cheatham lock and dam	\$959,000		\$959,000	
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)					Lake City	295,000		295,000	
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir				\$200,000	Texas:				
Oklahoma:					Brazos Island Harbor	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				150,000	Buffalo Bayou	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Broken Bow Reservoir					Canyon Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Texas.)					Cooper Reservoir and channels	800,000		800,000	
Enid			250,000		Corpus Christi Bridge	915,000		915,000	
Eufaula Reservoir	\$7,500,000		7,500,000		Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.:				
Keystone Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000		Highway bridge at Willis Ferry site	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Oologah Reservoir	10,000,000		10,000,000		Galveston Harbor and Channel seawall	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Optima Reservoir (deferred for restudy)				25,000	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:				
Oregon:					a—Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Blue River Reservoir		105,000		105,000	b—Realigned route, vicinity Aransas Pass	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.: 27-foot channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		Houston ship channel	800,000		800,000	
Columbia River local protection:					Lampasas Reservoir		\$125,000		\$125,000
John Day River		16,000		16,000	McGee Bend Dam	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Cougar Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000		McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
Fall Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000	Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)				
Green Peter Reservoir		310,000		310,000	Navarro Mills Reservoir			150,000	
Hills Creek Reservoir	13,000,000		13,000,000		Navidad and Lavaca Rivers, channel improvement at Hallettsville			333,000	
Holley Reservoir		110,000		110,000	Pass Cavallo Port Lavaca			377,000	
Interstate Bridge, Oregon and Washington			50,000		Pecos				50,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	8,000,000		8,000,000		Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:				
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:					36-foot channel	1,300,000		1,300,000	
a—Magruder Drainage District				5,000	Proctor Reservoir		125,000		125,000
b—Multnomah County Drainage District No. 1	600,000		600,000		Red River levees below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)				
c—Woodson Drainage District				6,000	Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Rogue River at Gold Beach			750,000		San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash.	13,500,000		13,500,000		Somerville Reservoir				75,000
Willamette River Basin bank protection	500,000		500,000		Texas City Channel:				
Willamette River Basin channel improvement and major drainage:					36-foot channel			500,000	
a—Calapooya River				50,000	Waco Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
b—East Muddy and Lake Creek				30,000	Utah:				
Pennsylvania:					Salt Lake City	300,000		150,000	
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa.	1,000,000		1,000,000		Vermont:				
Allentown	700,000		700,000		Ball Mountain Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000	
Bear Creek Reservoir	1,740,000		1,740,000		East Barre Reservoir (modification)			678,000	
Bethlehem			350,000			678,000		678,000	
Bradford	2,750,000		2,750,000		North Hartland Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000	
Brookville				35,000	North Springfield Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Chartiers Creek at and in vicinity of Washington				25,000	Townsend Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Curwensville Reservoir		175,000		175,000	Virginia:				
Dam 8, Monongahela River	2,000,000		2,000,000		Hays Reservoir (deferred for study)				10,000
Delaware River (Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton), Pa. and N. J. (See New Jersey.)					Norfolk Harbor, widen 40-foot channel	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Dyberry Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000		Norfolk & Portsmouth Belt Line R.R. bridge	240,000		240,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir			800,000		Pound Reservoir		150,000		200,000
Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River		275,000		275,000	Washington:				
New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)					Chief Joseph Dam	2,400,000		2,400,000	
Prompton Reservoir	1,100,000		1,100,000		Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., 27-foot channel. (See Oregon.)				
Ridgway				20,000	Eagle Gorge Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
St. Marys				20,000	Ice Harbor lock and dam	22,500,000		22,500,000	
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio				100,000	Interstate Bridge, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Stillwater Reservoir	1,300,000		1,300,000		John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Rhode Island:					Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:				
Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts				600,000	Wahkiakum County Consolidated Diking District No. 1				72,000
Woonsocket	1,200,000		1,200,000		Lower Monumental lock and dam		550,000		550,000
South Carolina:					The Dalles Dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)					Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River	270,000		270,000	
South Dakota:					West Virginia:				
Big Bend Reservoir		200,000		600,000	Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)				40,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa (including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota. (See Iowa.)					East Rainelle				
Oahe Reservoir	38,800,000		38,800,000		Hildebrand lock and dam	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Sioux Falls	1,900,000		1,900,000		New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)		125,000		125,000
					Opekiska lock and dam				
					Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				55,000
					Princeton				
					Sutton Reservoir	12,000,000		12,000,000	

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Wisconsin: Bayfield Harbor.....			\$122,000		Small authorized projects.....			\$4,000,000	
Wyoming: Jackson Hole.....	\$400,000		400,000		Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages.....	—\$30,000,000		—30,000,000	
Sheridan.....	400,000		400,000		Total.....	557,520,000	\$5,500,000		
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation.....	3,000,000		3,000,000		Lower Columbia River fish and sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service).....	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Emergency bank protection.....	200,000		200,000		Grand total, construction, general.....	559,120,000	5,500,000	503,770,000	\$9,476,500
Snagging and clearing.....	600,000		600,000			(564,620,000)		(603,246,500)	
Projects deferred for restudy.....		\$16,000		\$16,000					
Recreation facilities, completed projects.....			750,000						

¹ Included in total for small authorized projects.

The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement with the House Report statement concerning the use of funds for the Allegheny River Reservoir project.

The managers on the part of the House are not in agreement with the Senate report statement concerning an uncontrolled outlet for the Abiquiu Dam.

The conferees are in agreement that additional available funds up to a total of \$160,000 may be used for property protection work on the North Springfield Reservoir.

The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement that \$250,000 of the amount provided for recreational facilities shall be used for additional facilities at Dennison Reservoir.

The conferees are in agreement that the

Corps should utilize up to \$500,000 of available funds for planning on the Bruce's Eddy Reservoir.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement that the intent of the language provision involved is to prevent the use of any funds on the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth for the specific purpose of furthering a nine-foot navigation channel. The Senate language which has been adopted is applicable to only the "Construction, general," appropriation, whereas the House language was applicable to all appropriations. The managers on the part of the House have

accepted the Senate change in order not to preclude necessary maintenance or emergency dredging to previous project depths.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$113,370,000 instead of \$109,370,000 as proposed by the House and \$115,970,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$68,347,500 instead of \$67,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,960,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds in this appropriation item are to be allocated as follows:

Projects	Budget estimate, 1959		Conference allowance		Projects	Budget estimate, 1959		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations: (a) Examinations and surveys.....	\$150,000		\$250,000		2. Construction and planning—Con. Tensas Basin.....				
(b) Collection and study of basic data.....	50,000		50,000		Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.....	\$990,000		\$1,090,000	
Subtotal, general investigations.....	200,000		300,000		Red River backwater.....	135,000		135,000	
2. Construction and planning: Mississippi River levees.....	2,700,000		2,950,000		Yazoo Basin: Sardis Reservoir.....	130,000		130,000	
Channel improvement.....	22,555,000		23,277,500		Enid Reservoir.....	95,000		95,000	
Memphis Harbor.....	550,000		550,000		Arkabutla Reservoir.....	60,000		60,000	
Vicksburg Harbor.....	750,000		750,000		Grenada Reservoir.....	90,000		90,000	
Baton Rouge Harbor.....	250,000		250,000		Auxiliary channels.....	2,075,000		2,075,000	
Old River control.....	8,550,000		8,550,000		Main stem.....	400,000		400,000	
St. Francis Basin.....	3,900,000		4,000,000		Tributaries.....	175,000		175,000	
Reelfoot Lake.....	40,000		40,000		Big Sunflower River, etc.....	925,000		925,000	
West Tennessee tributaries.....				75,000	Atchafalaya Basin.....	5,430,000		5,430,000	
Lower Arkansas.....	500,000		500,000		Lake Pontchartrain.....	500,000		500,000	
					Total construction and planning.....	50,800,000		51,972,500	\$75,000
					3. Maintenance.....	16,000,000		16,000,000	
					Grand total.....	67,000,000		68,347,500	

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$4,556,000 instead of \$4,365,474 as proposed by the House and \$5,252,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement that none of the funds provided are to be used for studies of the Middle Snake Basin.

Amendment No. 8: Strikes out language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Provides that \$3,831,000 of the funds appropriated under the General Investigations heading shall be derived from the Reclamation Fund, instead of \$3,640,474 as proposed by the House and \$4,427,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$146,015,000 instead of \$138,986,141 as proposed by the House and \$153,347,000 as proposed by

the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, 1959	Conference allowance
Arizona: Colorado River front work and levee system.....		\$275,000
California: Central Valley project: Exclusive of Trinity River division.....	\$1,786,099	1,786,099
Trinity River division.....	41,472,901	41,472,901
Santa Maria project.....	1,629,000	1,629,000
Solano project.....	1,081,000	1,081,000
Ventura River project.....	10,058,000	10,058,000
Colorado: Collbran project.....	4,618,000	4,618,000
Idaho: Little Wood River project.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Palisades reregulating dam and powerplant (Burns Creek).....		500,000
Montana-North Dakota: Fort Peck project.....	2,000,000	2,000,000

State and project	Budget estimate, 1959	Conference allowance
Nevada-California: Washoe project, Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir.....		\$800,000
New Mexico: Middle Rio Grande project.....	\$3,628,000	3,628,000
McMillan Delta project.....		225,000
Oklahoma: Washita Basin project.....	6,500,000	8,000,000
Oregon: Crooked River project.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Rogue River project, Talent division.....	9,500,000	9,500,000
Wapinitia project, Juniper division.....		95,000
Texas: Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division.....		500,000
San Angelo.....		500,000
Utah: Weber Basin project.....	5,273,000	5,273,000
Washington: Columbia Basin project.....	10,000,000	10,000,000

State and project	Budget estimate, 1959	Conference allowance
Wyoming:		
Eden project.....	\$615,000	\$615,000
Shoshone project.....	501,000	501,000
Drainage and minor construction.....	2,564,000	3,124,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	2,603,000	2,603,000
Subtotal (exclusive of MRB).....	105,924,000	110,784,000
Missouri River Basin project:		
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska.....		1,100,000
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	1,790,000	1,790,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska.....		750,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	3,800,000	3,800,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming.....	11,000,000	11,000,000
Helena Valley Unit, Montana.....	2,538,000	2,538,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming.....	1,192,000	1,192,000
Transmission division.....	9,988,000	9,884,000
Webster unit, Kansas.....	1,218,000	1,218,000
Drainage and minor construction.....	560,000	721,000
Investigations.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Other Department of the Interior agencies.....	3,000,000	2,238,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin.....	37,086,000	38,231,000
Grand total, construction and rehabilitation.....	143,010,000	149,015,000
Less anticipated slippage in 1959.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total appropriation.....	140,010,000	146,015,000

The conference committee feels that the Bureau of Reclamation should continue its efforts to renegotiate the contracts for repayment on the Columbia Basin project. The basic concept of the Reclamation law is that water users should repay the government in accordance with their ability to repay. It is better that this policy be applied to all projects. In addition to the amount provided for the Columbia Basin project, up to \$1,000,000 of additional funds may be applied if such funds are available.

With respect to the Glendo Unit of Missouri River Basin Project, the conferees are in agreement that up to \$700,000 of the funds allocated to this project may be used for the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir.

Amendment No. 11: Provides that \$85,000,000 of the appropriation under this heading shall be derived from the Reclamation Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$85,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insert Senate language providing that none of the funds appropriated shall be used for the Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir or the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir until authorized by law. The motion will delete language precluding the use of funds for payments to the Crow Indians as authorized in S. J. Res. 12.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$5,434,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,800,000 as proposed by the House.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$4,039,000 instead of \$3,914,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,164,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Upper Colorado River Basin Fund

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$68,033,335 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$67,173,585 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that the funds

appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, 1959	Conference allowance
Colorado River storage project:		
Flaming Gorge unit, Utah.....	\$10,500,000	\$10,098,335
Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah.....	49,000,000	47,960,000
Navajo unit, New Mexico.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
Transmission division.....	205,000	205,000
Advance planning.....	770,000	770,000
Subtotal.....	67,475,000	66,033,335
Participating projects:		
Paonia project, Colorado.....		1,000,000
Central Utah project, Vernal unit, Utah.....		1,000,000
Total Upper Colorado River Basin fund.....	67,475,000	68,033,335

Amendment No. 16: Strikes House language no longer necessary in view of conference action on the Paonia project.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 17: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman tell us in a few words what happened in this conference between the House and the Senate? Was this bill increased? Was it decreased? What happened?

Mr. CANNON. It is always customary. I always make such a statement, and I shall make no exception to the rule in this case. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to the routine.

Mr. Speaker, the total estimates received from the Bureau of the Budget on this bill were \$1,077,756,000.

The bill as it passed the House carried \$1,077,827,200.

The Senate bill increased that amount to \$1,159,915,835.

The conference report which we bring in today reduces the amount of the Senate bill to \$1,118,128,835.

The final conference figures are in excess of the budget by \$40,722,825. The final conference report is in excess of the House figures by \$40,301,635, but it is a reduction under the Senate figures of \$41,787,000.

The Senate added 114 unbudgeted civil functions projects, to the House bill. These 114 projects increased the bill by \$1,393,927,000; that is in the ultimate total cost of the projects.

Of these 114 projects the Senate receded on 45, and the House receded on 72. But the total amount represented by the projects the Senate receded on was \$812,950,000, whereas the total amount represented by those the House receded on was only \$580,977,000. So it is evident that in conference the House was able to reduce the Senate figures on

civil functions by a much larger amount than that represented by the items on which the House receded.

On the matter of the general investigations item for the Corps of Engineers—and I make this statement as a basis for future reference—the House conferees agreed to an increase of \$1,150,000 for navigation and flood-control surveys with the understanding that these funds would be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to the most urgent unbudgeted projects on which testimony was received from Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would appreciate some information as to the criteria the conferees used in eliminating projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is entirely too large. It comprises many items we could get along without. It appropriates vast sums of money that should not be appropriated. And yet people ask, Why do you not appropriate more money?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman suggest that the House vote against the conference report?

Mr. CANNON. I would not object, and I think the gentleman would be within his rights, and undoubtedly the United States Treasury would be in a much better situation if enough Members joined the gentleman in that position. But we must be realistic.

The Senate insists it is a part of the United States Government; the Members from New York, California, and Texas insist their respective States are still in the Union. We must meet the problem in a practical manner.

We have done that. But if it meets with the disapproval of the House, I shall be the last one to object.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that one of the reasons the bill has as many items in it as it has is that the committee under the gentleman's direction ordered the Engineers to come back with a larger budget than they presented originally?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says the committee "under my direction." There are 50 veteran members of this committee. My experience is that they are the hardest-headed men in the entire House. It is the largest committee and the most ungovernable committee, in any legislative body or in any Congress.

So I regret to have to tell the gentleman that I am not in position always to direct that committee as to what it shall do, and shall not do, and I think it is unfortunate sometimes that I cannot.

However, I may say to the gentleman that the original budget submission was designed to set back the construction schedules on 124 going projects out of 146 in the construction stage. The amendment to the budget was requested after extensive testimony to the effect that the stretch-out budget would cost the taxpayers more than necessary on these projects. The purpose of the amended budget was to put these projects back on economical construction schedules and save the taxpayers unnecessary expenses.

And in that connection, may I say, Mr. Speaker, the bill and the statement of the managers both include language of great importance concerning the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth. The language of the bill is as follows:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated for "Construction, General", in this act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth", for any purpose other than bank stabilization work.

The conferees' statement appears in conference report on page 20. It is as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement that the intent of the language provision involved is to prevent the use of any funds on the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth for the specific purpose of furthering a 9-foot navigation channel. The Senate language which has been adopted is applicable to only the "Construction, general," appropriation, whereas the House language was applicable to all appropriations. The managers on the part of the House have accepted the Senate change in order not to preclude necessary maintenance or emergency dredging to previous project depths.

The engineers have dreamed for years of a 9-foot channel in this part of the river, which is wholly impractical.

Every year the Congress has included language in the bill or the report to prevent abortive attempts to sink such a channel, but testimony this year indicates that they are still futilely working at it. The purpose and intent of both Houses is clearly set out in this legislation and failure to abide by it must be considered as a violation of law.

Questions have been raised on one other item which appeared in the Senate report. It does not affect the bill or conference report but it should be noted in the record. The conferees of both Houses agreed during the course of the conference meetings to abandon the Senate report statement on Cow Creek.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Appropriations Committee has told the House the amount that is in this bill and the amount by which it is over the budget, which is a little over \$40 million. The House reduced the budget by a small amount. The Senate, of course, then raised the House figures

by a great amount. We did bring the Senate figures down considerably, as you will note by the report.

This conference report has the unanimous approval of the Members of the House who were on the conference.

Now, the \$1,118,128,835 which this bill provides is, of course, a great, huge amount. But, we must remember that every dime in this bill is to be spent and will be spent for flood control, for the conservation of soil and the protection of life and property and other purposes that add to the assets of our Nation. As I said on the floor of the House when the bill was before us, while this amount is great, it is a very, very small fraction of what we appropriated for national defense, even a small fraction of what we appropriate for foreign aid. But, certainly this bill, which covers so many projects, some 350 scattered all over the United States, flood control projects, irrigation projects, hydroelectric dams, reclamation projects in the 17 western States, river and harbor improvements, dredging of harbors, and a multitude of others, contains things which we must carry on as a government of the people.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is anything in here or has there been anything taken out for the flood control projects in the Naugatuck Valley in Connecticut. I know about the \$5 million for the Thomaston Dam but nothing else.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, the report speaks for itself regarding construction projects. They are each set forth individually. If your question is in reference to investigations, you will note that we agreed to \$1,150,000 more than in the House bill for surveys which the Army Engineers will allocate to those projects that they feel are most justified.

Mr. PATTERSON. May I ask the gentleman a further question? As to this money that is being appropriated to the Army Engineers, are they going to be the sole distributors of the particular funds for the respective projects, or who is going to decide that?

Mr. JENSEN. We decide it by individual projects except for this lump sum amount. The Congress has decided on all of these projects listed in the statement of the managers.

Mr. PATTERSON. The only thing it shows is the Thomaston Reservoir.

Mr. JENSEN. If the project the gentleman is interested in is not indicated in this list then it is possible that the Army Engineers will allocate funds for a survey of the project in which he is interested.

Mr. PATTERSON. I notice on page 4 of the report there are set forth appropriations for flood control; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. On page 4 under "Flood control studies" there is a certain amount of money appropriated for flood-control studies. What I wanted to know is, is this appropriation going to cover the studies and the surveys and

the flood-control projects for the Naugatuck Valley, which includes Winsted, Torrington, and the rest of them?

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman's project is an authorized project—

Mr. PATTERSON. It has been authorized.

Mr. JENSEN. And the Army engineers have recommended survey funds for that project—

Mr. PATTERSON. They have done that.

Mr. JENSEN. Then the Army engineers now have authority under the language of this report to allocate funds to the project, because we gave them full authority to use their best judgment and discretion in allocating this \$1,150,000 to the projects that they considered the most justified and the most urgent.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then the gentleman is saying that the Army engineers are the ones who finally must decide whether or not the projects in the Naugatuck Valley are going to be taken care of; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. PATTERSON. And the surveys?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; they are limited to surveys in exercising that authority.

Mr. PATTERSON. They are the sole judges on whether that should be done or not?

Mr. JENSEN. At least for the fiscal year 1959, and with regard to this million dollars plus.

Mr. PATTERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply gratified that the public works appropriations bill of 1959 provides an additional \$5 million for construction work on the Thomaston Dam and Reservoir, that is the key to the flood-control system for the Naugatuck Valley, but I emphatically deplore the omission of planning funds for the authorized dry dams and reservoirs for the protection of Winsted and Torrington, Conn.

I sought with all the emphasis at my command to convince the House Appropriations Committee to provide the planning funds recommended by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

I think it is most regrettable that this Congress saw fit to ignore the urgent pleas for protection for the flood-hazard communities of Winsted and Torrington that were terribly devastated in the disastrous floods of 1955. It is more than regrettable—it is reprehensible—and that is an understatement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would include the Merrimack Valley also, would it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I will say to the gentlewoman, that if her project is not included in this list of projects, if it has been authorized for a survey and the Army engineers have indicated a willingness to spend money for a survey of the project in which the lady is interested, then they have the discretion under the language of this report to al-

locate money to the project in which the lady is interested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This only includes surveys; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Because the engineers already have under the law the authority to go ahead with local flood construction projects when indicated by the engineers.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEAL. There is an item of \$145,000 for planning on one of the locks and dams of the Ohio River which was eliminated from this report. Do I understand that the United States Army engineers have the authority if they see fit to allocate money for the planning of this particular dam?

Mr. JENSEN. If it is construction, the answer is "No"; if it is a survey, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. NEAL. Surveys and planning.

Mr. JENSEN. Just surveys.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has again expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today Congress recognizes the part the Port of Monroe, Mich., will play in future development of the interior of our continent.

We have approved an expenditure of \$1 million to restore Monroe Harbor to project depth. It will enable Monroe to receive and export the products of world commerce as an integral part of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I wish to express my thanks to the House Appropriations Committee for responding to the presentation we made establishing the Monroe Harbor restoration as a meritorious project.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the help Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan, gave us in guiding the legislation through the United States Senate.

Today is a red-letter day for Monroe and the Second District of Michigan.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed with this conference report on the public works appropriation bill for 1959 being submitted to this body minus funds for an uncontrolled outlet at the Abiquiu Dam in New Mexico.

According to page 18756 of the RECORD of today, wherein this conference report is reproduced, there appears the following sentence:

The managers on the part of the House are not in agreement with the Senate report statement concerning an uncontrolled outlet for the Abiquiu dam.

To those of us familiar with the events, facts, and past history connected with

the Abiquiu project this is most frustrating and shocking. It means the House conferees, in withdrawing the provision for an uncontrolled outlet have sanctioned the Congress on the part of the House to break a promise to the people of Texas and the members of the Rio Grande Compact in connection with this project.

The 80th Congress passed H. R. 6419 for the construction of a dam on the Rio Chama at Chamita, in New Mexico. This original legislation mentioned a dam at Chamita only and did not mention a dam at Abiquiu. In a letter to me dated September 4, 1957, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell held that this original legislation (H. R. 6419, 80th Congress) be held in effect as the authorizing legislation.

However, the Chamita dam would have stored and retained 752,000 acre-feet of water annually. Since the Chama River empties into the Rio Grande, which serves Texas' water needs, the State of Texas objected to the storing of more than 752,000 acre-feet of water while only approximately one-third that much would be sent into the Chama. Obviously, this would create serious water shortages in the Texas area already suffering from water problems.

In September of 1953, the Army Corps of Engineers asked to amend the original proposal to construct not one but two dams. One of them would be located at the previously mentioned Chamita site; the other at Abiquiu. Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief, Army Corps of Engineers, has stated his investigations revealed the new location at Abiquiu would save approximately \$8,900,000 in construction costs. Accordingly, in June of 1954, a meeting was held between Col. C. Barnes, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Mr. Louis A. Scott, Rio Grande compact commissioner of Texas. It was agreed that Texas would allow the construction of the second proposed dam on the Abiquiu site only if an uncontrolled outlet would be provided to insure Texas getting its fair share of the water, as called for in the Rio Grande Compact of 1948 and to limit the storage in the two reservoirs to the amount authorized in the Chamita dam alone. Of this General Itschner has stated: "The Corps of Engineers agreed that the Texas commissioner was within his rights to request such limitation."

Senator Price Daniel, of Texas, and Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, agreed to this compromise and it was incorporated in S. 1555 of the 83d Congress and S. 500 of the 84th Congress. The compromise was set out in subparagraphs A and B of Public Law 858, 80th Congress, as concerns the maximum storage. Further, Public Law 858 made no mention of a dam at Abiquiu yet the fiscal 1957 budget called for \$1,500,000 for this purpose.

I have letters in my files from the Army Corps of Engineers saying that at all times the Department of the Army has felt the uncontrolled outlet is required by the authorizing legislation. In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, General Itschner said there was a moral obligation for the

Corps of Engineers to support the uncontrolled outlet because the project was authorized on that basis.

It seems clear past Congressional intent has been to provide the uncontrolled outlet. On May 20, 1956, by an overwhelming vote and with but one member dissenting, the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee placed in the appropriations bill a provision that the uncontrolled outlet would be provided. The Senate committee report of July 12, 1957—Senate Report 609—directed the Corps of Engineers to provide an uncontrolled outlet. House Report No. 1049, page 10, Report on Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1958, called for the uncontrolled outlet. Such provision was in a conference report agreed to by both Houses of Congress and the bill was approved on August 26, 1957, becoming Public Law 85-167, 85th Congress. And the Senate inserted the needed uncontrolled outlet provision again this year.

Now the House conferees have violated all agreements and past Congressional intent by removing from the conference report this year the requirements for an uncontrolled outlet. This is thanks the people of Texas have been given for going along with the Abiquiu project in order to save the United States Treasury almost \$9 million. This action now sees Texas in danger of its downstream water rights; a Texas that presently sees New Mexico owing it more than 500,000 acre-feet of water under the terms of the Rio Grande compact.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, the House conferees have lived up to the agreements mentioned herein; nor have they upheld past Congressional intent, nor have given proper consideration to the requirements of the authorizing legislation in their unwise action of removing the uncontrolled outlet from the Abiquiu project.

I would point out that Senators from New Mexico and Texas, and Members of the House from New Mexico and Texas have all agreed that the uncontrolled outlet should be provided. In short, the House conferees seem to speak for a definite minority in insisting that the uncontrolled outlet be dropped. They have caused some doubts as to the worth of the entire Abiquiu project in so doing.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the conference report on this legislation—public works appropriation bill—will be an important step in assisting Indiana in solving its critical flood-control problem. I trust that this conference report will be adopted.

There is in this bill \$3.4 million for the continued construction of the Mansfield Reservoir which will be of great value to the prevention of floods on the Wabash River. I am very happy to say that there is also included in this bill \$25,000 for the planning of the Monroe Reservoir on Salt Creek, a tributary of the East Fork of the White River. This project will necessitate cooperation between the Federal Government and the State of Indiana, as it is not only a flood-control project but a pioneer project where the values of water retention are considered in addition to those of flood control.

The House was unable to consider the Salt Creek project when the appropriation bill was passed by the House on June 19, 1958. The authorization bill which included this project was not signed by the President until July 3, 1958; and a project cannot be included in an appropriation bill until it has been authorized. The Senate, however, was able to place this much-needed Salt Creek project in the bill adopted July 9, 1958.

New flood-control projects have been greatly handicapped in the last few years because there had been no omnibus authorization bill enacted since 1954. The omnibus authorization bills of 1955 and 1957 were both vetoed by the President because they contained projects which had not been properly approved by the United States Corps of Engineers.

The flood conditions in Indiana have become very critical. Floods have destroyed a substantial part of the crops in the great rich bottoms of the Wabash River Valley, including both the East and West Forks of the White River and their tributaries, during each of the last 3 years. If this cycle of weather continues, a substantial part of this great breadbasket of the Midwest will be of limited value unless aid is received.

Indiana does have an agency, the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, which is doing a very fine job and has been making a thorough study of our problems. In addition to Salt Creek Reservoir, three other reservoirs were included in the authorization bill signed by the President on July 3, 1958. These reservoirs will give great protection to the Wabash Valley when completed and will be located on the Salamonie, the Mississinewa, and the Wabash Rivers. We hope to get appropriations for these reservoirs in the budget for this coming year.

I am also pleased to observe that this conference report includes money for work on levees which are much needed in Indiana.

The Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, in cooperation with the United States Corps of Engineers, has been working toward an integrated flood control program. Interested communities in Indiana are holding meetings and making plans to assume their part in flood control. New levee construction is being planned as part of a well-designed and scientific pattern to get the maximum value from levees.

However, we are well aware that levees alone cannot give adequate flood control protection. It is necessary to retain the water in reservoirs upstream. This is desirable not only for flood protection but for the utilization of the water during periods of drought. With the reservoirs now planned on the upper Wabash River and the additional ones that we hope to have approved in the next authorization bill and with the completion of a reasonable levee system, the great Wabash River will be harnessed to properly serve the people and not to destroy their handiwork.

The situation of the White River is more complex as there are not sufficient locations on the upper White River and

its tributaries to construct large reservoirs. However, in Greene County there are at least one or two locations where fair sized reservoirs could be created. The possible locations of other smaller reservoirs are being studied. We are primarily compelled to rely on levees and small lakes and ponds throughout the White River watershed to control the excess water. In this regard I want to call attention to the Small Watersheds Act enacted in 1954. The act envisioned the retention of the water in the area in which it falls. The water level in Indiana has been lowering at an alarming rate within the last 15 years. Earlier in Indiana the forests and the beaver dams held the water to prevent both floods and water shortages. Among other things, this legislation is designed to accomplish the construction of many ponds and small lakes which will not only prevent erosion and floods but will provide a source of surface and underground water which will add greatly to the value of the land. In addition they will provide tremendous possibilities for recreation.

I am happy and proud to say that two of the very early watershed projects under this legislation have been started in the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana. They are the Busseron Creek project, principally in Sullivan County, and the Prairie Creek project in Daviess County, both of which have been recently approved by the proper agencies and by Congress. I am encouraging people in other areas to investigate such projects. I am hopeful that these small watershed districts will be organized in the upper reaches of both forks of White River because they will not only benefit these localities but will also slow down the rush of water from these areas and so protect the lower part of the White River from floods.

We do have great flood problems in Indiana—problems which have been increasing in the last few years. We are working to establish methods of control which will make water the great asset it can be rather than the liability it becomes when uncontrolled. We are working hard to solve these problems and are asking Federal assistance along those lines that have been considered Federal responsibility for many years. We are grateful for the inclusion of these flood-control projects in the authorization bill of 1958 and for the inclusion of these projects in this conference report. I hope that the House can now accept them as is recommended by the conference committee.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to speak for conservationists and sportsmen in opposition to Bruce Eddy project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho.

I am sorry that the conferees on the Public Works appropriation bill, H. R. 12858, agreed that the Corps of Engineers should utilize up to \$500,000 of available funds for planning this project, which has never been able to clear a legislative committee of the House.

Bruce Eddy would do irreparable damage to natural resources and to wildlife. It would create a lake nearly

50 miles long in the narrow canyon of the Clearwater, flooding 12,000 acres of vital winter range for one of this country's largest elk herds. It would obstruct the runs of migratory salmon and steelhead trout.

Bruce Eddy is not one of the main control plan projects. It is being pushed in an effort to recapture some of the needed flood-control storage sacrificed by this administration to commercial underdevelopment at Hells Canyon.

One of the giveaways at Hells Canyon is the loss of almost 3 million acre-feet of storage. The Federal Power Commission recognized this in its final decision, which touched upon this question of loss of storage on the Snake and Columbia Rivers by the licensing of the Idaho Power Co. dams.

The Commission said:

If applicant (Idaho Power Co.) is to be permitted to construct its developments, an additional amount of flood control would have to be provided elsewhere. We have previously pointed out some possibilities of providing this storage, although its relative cost is not shown. However, we are convinced from the record that the provision of such storage should not be a problem from the standpoint of availability of other sites.

Bruce Eddy would create a reservoir of 1,433,000 acre-feet of usable storage. It would replace about half the storage lost to the giveaway at Hells Canyon. As an alternative to full utilization of the rugged canyon that forms a huge natural reservoir at Hells Canyon, it is proposed here to inundate one of the last upland wildernesses in America, destroy a unique scenic and recreational area and lose important fish and wildlife resources.

The other possibilities mentioned by the Power Commission for upstream storage were 4,250,000 acre-feet at Libby Dam, Mont., and 3,160,000 acre-feet at Glacier View Dam, Mont.

Everyone is for the Libby project, even the administration. It is easy to declare oneself for Libby, because it is tied up before the International Joint Commission. Glacier View's storage could be obtained only by invading Glacier National Park.

Informed conservationists and sportsmen, not only in the West but throughout the United States, are opposed to Bruce Eddy. Many of them have registered their objections to me, as individuals and through their local and State organizations. The National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Izaak Walton League of America are among national organizations opposed to the project.

Bruce Eddy is too high a price to pay for the administration's abandonment of the public interest at Hells Canyon.

The Idaho Fish and Game Department has opposed Bruce Eddy because of studies which indicate a serious impact of this project on fish and wildlife resources. Similar studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service are incomplete. Appropriation of money for engineering planning will set a dangerous precedent for other projects not authorized for construction.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with the House conferees on this important appropriation bill.

My protest is over the discriminatory manner in which the committee refuses to accept an item in the Senate version of the appropriation bill that would have provided \$1 million for special construction on the Summersville Reservoir on the Gauley River in West Virginia.

On checking the bills approved by the conference committee, I find 41 items inserted by the conferees which were not included in the budget estimate. Many of these projects did not have the approval of the Army engineers and on many of them no survey which would indicate the cost had been made.

I, with my colleagues in West Virginia, had made a plea for this appropriation in order to provide jobs for hungry workmen living in the area where this project would have meant so much to alleviate the suffering of thousands of people presently unemployed. Projects were approved in areas where there is little, if any, unemployment. It would appear that the committee gave little or no consideration to use public-works projects to take up the slack in unemployment. There was no logrolling in this proposal. The committee's action was grossly unfair and, from the remarks made by one of the House conferees, their action was premeditated.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have supported today the conference report on the public works appropriations measure which contains, among many other items, a small amount for advance planning by Army engineers of the Monroe Reservoir project in Indiana.

This proposed reservoir will mean much to farmers and business people of my own District and other areas of southern Indiana because it will do much to control floodwaters and conserve water in the White River area. It is my sincere hope that next year will see more progress on the reservoir project, which now has been formally authorized by this Congress.

As a part of this overall White River-Wabash River flood control objective, which fits into the general Ohio River development program, I have in mind projects to control portions of the Muscatatuck River in south central Indiana. This would mean a great deal to the economy of several Indiana counties, particularly Jennings, Scott, and Jackson in my own Congressional District.

The Indiana Water Resources Commission has investigated two or three proposals for dam sites on the Muscatatuck in the vicinity of North Vernon, Ind., in Jennings County. United States Army engineers also have become interested in the matter and they agree that flood control and water conservation of that river is most desirable.

It is my intention to bring this problem before Congress next year and press for authorization of Muscatatuck River work. At this point, however, I wish to compliment the House and the other Chamber for having enacted needed

legislation in the appropriations measure just approved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 4, line 6, after the figure insert "of which \$273,000 shall be available for the acquisition of telephone facilities, and for the readjustment of service in the vicinity of Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 17, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir (Washoe project, California-Nevada) until the enactment into law of S. 4009, or similar legislation: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir (Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project) until said dam and reservoir are specifically authorized: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for payments (or transfers) authorized in S. J. Res. 12, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir (Washoe project, California-Nevada) until the enactment into law of S. 4009, or similar legislation: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir (Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project) until said dam and reservoir are specifically authorized."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 16, line 16, insert the following: "Not to exceed \$125,000 of the funds made available for the Solano project, California, shall be available for the construction of safety and public-use facilities which shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 16, line 20, insert the following: "Not to exceed \$600,000 of the amount appropriated herein for the Washita Basin project, Oklahoma,

shall be nonreimbursable representing that portion of the cost of the Foss Dam and Reservoir allocated to furnish a water supply for the Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MORANO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell me why a Senate amendment which provided a million dollars for a start on the Bridgeport Harbor navigation project, and another Senate amendment which provided \$150,000 for a start on the beach erosion project in Fairfield County, were deleted from the conference report?

Mr. CANNON. The reason they were omitted is that there were not enough votes in the conference on either side of the table to put them in.

Mr. MORANO. Is there some reason other than that? What was the reasoning behind the casting of those votes?

Mr. CANNON. Fundamental parliamentary procedure requires a majority in order to include an item, and a majority was not available.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman later yield to me to ask a question when the conference report is being considered?

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, when the situation permits.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, after the statement of the Managers on the part of the House is read, if we have any objections to any of the amendments in the conference report; is there then time to discuss them?

The SPEAKER. There is if the gentleman from Missouri will yield for a discussion.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to be sure that the gentleman from Missouri will yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have never yet refused to yield to anyone asking a legitimate question on any matter coming before the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2677)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 26, 37, 39, 46, 47, 49, 53, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 104, 107, 111, 117, 119 and 120.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 13, 19, 27, 30, 32, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 55, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 109, 115, 116, 121, 122, 123 and 124, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,530,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

"For construction and equipment at laboratories and other installations of the Na-

tional Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, established by the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 888), as amended, \$40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14), including not to exceed \$200,000 for necessary expenses during the current fiscal year of technical services rendered by other agencies, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$130,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$186,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,397,406,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, General', \$70,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment

as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"LOAN PROGRAM

"For an additional amount, \$4,203,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 36, 40, 42, 48, 50, 56, 58, 62, 65, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 112, 113, 114, 118, 125, and 126.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
C. W. VURSELL,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House,

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLAN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate,

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$3,500,000 for plant and animal disease and pest control instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion which will provide \$500,000 additional for the contingency fund to be used to meet a recent infestation of pink bollworm in the Southwest. In order to establish a long-range program for permanent eradication of this pest, the Departments of State and Agriculture are requested to undertake negotiations with Mexico to establish a cotton-free zone along the United States-Mexican border to prevent its spread between the two countries.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$1,750,000 for meat inspection as proposed by the House instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Bank Programs

Amendment Nos. 4 and 5: Appropriate \$279,450,000 for the acreage reserve program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$275,000,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize \$19,050,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,500,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$11,735,000 for operation and regulation as proposed

by the House instead of \$12,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Maritime Activities

Amendment No. 8: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide an additional \$25,000 for salaries and expenses.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate language. The conferees are in full agreement that these funds shall not be continued available for any purpose other than the payment of benefits to disabled seamen and shall be finally rescinded on June 30, 1959.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 10: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to increase the limitation on general administrative expenses by \$550,000.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 11: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide an additional \$262,000 for expenses.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$186,000 for plant and equipment as proposed by the House instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 13: Inserts headings.
Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—military functions

General Provision

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Army—Civil functions

Administration, Ryukyu Islands

Amendment Nos. 17 and 18: Appropriate \$2,830,000 instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,850,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize \$1,530,000 for administrative and information expenses instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

General Government matters

Executive Office of the President

Executive mansion and grounds

Amendment No. 19: Inserts chapter number and headings.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 21: Inserts heading.
Amendments Nos. 22 through 25: Reported in disagreement.

Corregidor—Bataan Memorial Commission

Amendment No. 26: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide \$46,000 for administrative expenses.

CHAPTER VII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 27: Changes chapter number.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$5,200,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service instead of \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Housing Administration

Amendment No. 30: Provides \$100,000 for administrative expenses and not to exceed \$4,500,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$300,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$461,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 32: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for research and development instead of \$70,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for construction and equipment instead of \$47,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Reported in disagreement.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for general operating expenses instead of \$4,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,269,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate which would appropriate \$450,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VIII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 41: Changes chapter number.

Departmental Offices

Office of Saline Water

The conferees are in agreement that the amount provided is solely for the planning and construction of pilot plants and improvement and operation of the test facility near Port Orange, Fla.

Office of Minerals Exploration

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to appropriate \$4 million for salaries and expenses. The conferees are in agreement that participation by the Federal Government in exploration project contracts should not exceed 50 percent of the actual project cost. In addition, emphasis should be placed on providing exploration assistance on those strategic and critical minerals and metals for which there is a serious shortage in the United States. Not to exceed \$900,000 of the amount provided shall be available for administration and technical services. In addition, not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available from the borrowing authority funds of the Office of Defense Mobilization for administering liquidation of contracts in force.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$18,500 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$885,000 for management of lands and resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that the 1959 contract authorization shall be carefully programmed to provide a balanced program throughout the current fiscal year without any advance from the 1960 authorization and expect that the obligation authority remaining under

the 1959 contract authorization will be apportioned accordingly.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$1,500,000 for surveys, investigations, and research as proposed by the House instead of \$2,483,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$1,250,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the House instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would provide an additional \$200,000 for construction. The conferees are in agreement that \$100,000 for acquisition of lands in connection with the Civil War Centennial Celebration, and \$100,000 for construction of facilities, in the event S. 765 is enacted into law, at the International Peace Garden, North Dakota, shall be made available from existing funds.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to appropriate \$8,000,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the 1959 contract authorization shall be carefully programmed to provide a balanced program throughout the current fiscal year without any advance from the 1960 authorization and expect that the obligation authority remaining under the 1959 contract authorization will be apportioned accordingly.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 51: Inserts heading.
Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$125,000 for management and investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate.
Amendment No. 53: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$675,000 for construction.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$40,000 for salaries and expenses, Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, instead of \$240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Historical and memorial commissions

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$20,000 for the Boston National Historic Sites Commission as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$350,000 for the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission instead of \$142,000 as proposed by the House and \$642,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IX

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 59: Changes chapter number. Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$14,200,000 shall be available as a contingency fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate are agreed that an average of 2,500,000 insured unemployment shall be used as the base in determining the availability of contingency funds for use by the States.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Gallaudet College

Amendment No. 61: Inserts heading.
Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$34,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Howard University

Amendment No. 64: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 65: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$396,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 67: Inserts heading.

Assistance for School Construction

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$50,000,000 of which \$200,000 is for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies instead of \$60,150,000 of which \$250,000 would be for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies as proposed by the Senate.

Payments to School Districts

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$130,000,000 instead of \$149,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$186,500 instead of \$316,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 71: Strikes heading proposed by the Senate.

Assistance to States, General

Amendment No. 72: Deletes appropriation of \$1,000,000 for grants to schools of Public Health proposed by the Senate.

Military Pay Increases

Amendment No. 73: Deletes heading proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74 through 81: Delete appropriations for military pay increases under eight appropriation items totaling \$634,000 proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 82: Changes chapter number.

Senate

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$102,160 for committee employees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 86, 87, and 88: Appropriate \$83,000 for inquiries and investigations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 89 and 90: Reported in disagreement.

House of Representatives

Amendment No. 91: Reported in disagreement.

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 92: Reported in disagreement.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 93: Reported in disagreement.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 94: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendment No. 95: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 96: Appropriates \$2,397,406,000 for operating expenses instead of \$2,375,972,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,418,840,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the full budget estimate of \$680,000,000 shall be allocated to the raw materials program and that the reduction below the Senate figure be allocated by the Atomic Energy Commission to other programs under this heading.

Amendment Nos. 97 and 98: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$249,929,000 for plant acquisition and construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$229,429,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XII

Public works

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Amendment Nos. 100 through 103: Insert chapter number and headings.

Amendment No. 104: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$1,925,000 for construction of rivers and harbors and flood control projects.

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates \$70,000 for operation and maintenance, general, rivers and harbors and flood control projects as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 106: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 107: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$2,500,000 for construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation.

Amendment No. 108: Appropriates \$4,203,000 for the loan program, Bureau of Reclamation as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII

Department of State

Amendment No. 109: Changes chapter number.

Administration of Foreign Affairs

Amendment No. 110: Appropriates \$550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$200,000 for international contingencies. The Department is authorized to proceed with arrangements for holding the Twelfth Session of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the United States.

United States Information Agency

Amendment Nos. 112, 113, and 114: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 115: Changes chapter number.

United States Secret Service

Amendment No. 116: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 117: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$54,000 for salaries and expenses, White House Police.

Amendment No. 118: Reported in disagreement.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 119: Appropriates \$150,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements as proposed by the House instead of \$399,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 120: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$29,500,000 to the Postal Modernization Fund. The managers on the part of both Houses agree that the Department should continue the contract engineering staff, associated with modernization projects, out of available funds.

CHAPTER XV

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 121: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 122: Inserts reference to Senate Document.

Amendment No. 123: Appropriates \$14,223,316 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,523,895 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XVI

General provisions

Amendment No. 124: Inserts chapter number and heading.

Amendment Nos. 125 and 126: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
C. W. VURSELL,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CANNON. Presently, just as soon as I make a statement. Then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. Speaker, the total estimates considered by the House on this bill were \$3,226,315,440. As passed by the House, the bill represented a substantial reduction, carrying a total of \$3,131,844,797. The bill then went to the other body. The Senate in due process received estimates which the House had not received as to matters which had come up after the bill passed by the House; and the Senate added items for which there was no budget request. The total estimate considered by the Senate aggregated \$4,081,154,221. The Senate cut that amount down to \$3,866,382,978.

The conference report which we submit here today further reduces that amount to \$3,684,805,478, a reduction of \$396,348,743, nearly 10 percent, below total estimates. As compared with the House bill, it is an increase of \$552,960,681. As compared with the Senate bill, it is a reduction of \$181,577,500. The principal reason for this marked discrepancy between the conference report and the two bills is that this bill, contrary to what might otherwise appear to be the core, is more of a regular annual bill than a supplemental bill. While it includes a number of supplemental items, they represent a relatively small percentage of the total. Nearly 85 percent of the conference total represents the regular annual appropriations for several agencies and activities. So it is only incidentally a supplemental appropriation total.

Of the conference report total of \$3,684,805,478, over \$3 billion—or, as I say, nearly 85 percent—is the regular annual appropriation. There are a half dozen or so items, but the principal items are:

Conference allowance

Atomic Energy Commission (regular annual budget) —	\$2,647,335,000
Small Business Administration (regular annual budget) —	203,500,000
Federally impacted area school assistance items (regular annual items) —	180,186,500

Total..... 3,031,021,500

As to the abnormally large increase of \$552,960,681 over the House bill, the

House should know that approximately \$496 million, or 90 percent, represents amounts not considered by the House when the bill was first here. There are many items involved, but just 3 of them account for \$463,686,500. These are:

Small Business Administration.....	\$203,500,000
New Space Agency.....	80,000,000
Federally impacted area school items.....	180,186,500
Total.....	463,686,500

So, Mr. Speaker, leaving aside these items not originally before the House, the conference agreement total is not unreasonable and represents a good compromise in relation to the original bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker—
Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] a question. The other body inserted an amendment appropriating approximately \$1 million for the start on the Bridgeport Harbor navigation project, and also inserted an amendment which would provide \$150,000 for beach erosion projects in my district.

I would like to know—obviously I know that there were not enough votes to keep it in—but I would like to know why it was taken out. Every engineering project, I understand, was taken out except one in Wisconsin for \$79,000. I would like to know why that was left in and why this one at Bridgeport was taken out.

Mr. CANNON. The Committee on Appropriations has been more than generous with the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and with his State. In the conference report on the Public works appropriations bill which has just been agreed to here on the floor within the last few minutes the great State of Connecticut was given, absolutely, every appropriation budgeted for that State that they asked for. Now they came in the very next minute after we had disposed of that subject.

Mr. MORANO. Which subject?

Mr. CANNON. The subject of public works appropriations. They came in the very next day after the conference report on the public works appropriation bill and the very next minute after it was agreed to here on the floor and asked for these and, of course, we could not grant them.

Why did they not ask for them in time to get in the bill?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I just want to say the great State of Connecticut did get in time and they were in when the bill went to conference. There must be some logical explanation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] is correct when he says that every project of this character submitted by the Senate was stricken from the bill. All of them were construction projects and all of them went out.

But the Wisconsin project for \$79,000 to which he refers was not a construction project. It was an operations and maintenance project. And the reason it was retained was that the purpose of the appropriation was to put the road in shape to turn over to the State for State maintenance. In short, it was a project to relieve the Federal Government of all future maintenance and was approved as an economy measure.

But even had proper classification applied, the Bridgeport Harbor item and the beach-erosion item were brought before us too late. There was no opportunity to consider them. There was no opportunity to hold hearings. It was too late to take them up. The proponents of the two items had the entire session in which they could have brought them before us, but they did not do so.

Furthermore, the gentleman is in error in regard to their approval. There was no approval by the President or the Bureau of the Budget. No estimates were submitted to the committee at any time.

The State of Connecticut received in full, in the public-works appropriation bill, just approved by the House, every budgeted item submitted to the committee.

I am certain the gentleman appreciates fully the courtesy and consideration shown him and his State by the committee.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that he is a little bit wrong when he states this is an excessive demand. This project in Bridgeport has been authorized, it has been recommended by the Budget Bureau, and we were given \$1,000,000 by the Senate to make a start on the Bridgeport Harbor and \$150,000 for beach erosion.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is mistaken, I am sorry. There was no budget estimate. The Committee on Appropriations makes enough mistakes at best, it too frequently provides money without due consideration. But certainly we should not be expected to provide money sight unseen, without any information whatever on which to base an appropriation. I trust the gentleman commends us for providing in full all estimates received for his State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are quite a lot of these things that come in at the last minute that it is impossible to cover in the way they were presented to the committee. When you go into a conference of that kind in the last days of the session, you cannot hold hearings. There were no hearings on any of these things that we could go by. These items for Connecticut that have been referred to here are mostly for either small projects or they are for items relating to other things. Until those things develop

a little further we cannot tell what we ought to do. Frankly, I do not see how we can possibly agree to those things at this time.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Can we get an assurance at least from the ranking minority member of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that earnest consideration will be given to these projects when we come back next year? That is if we come back next year.

Mr. TABER. If I am here next year and still a member of the committee, I will see to it that the State of Connecticut has plenty of opportunity to be heard on the projects that it is interested in.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to ask the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee what consideration was given to the items for the provision of funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. As I read the report, the request was for \$7 million for salaries and expenses, which was cut to \$5 million. There was a request for \$70 million for research and development which was cut to \$50 million. There was a request for equipment of \$47 million, which has been cut to \$25 million.

We have heard time after time in this House about the lack of progress being made in space research, and here we are with a new administration and holding it down to a very limited amount of money for salaries, a very limited amount of money for equipment, and with an impossible sum of money for the construction of new equipment that is already programmed down here in Beltsville. That is for a science laboratory. It seems to me that the committee has gone to an extreme in limiting this new agency to a pittance in order to get started. Will the gentleman tell me why these cuts were made?

Mr. TABER. I will try to tell the gentleman what has happened there. The Senate committee recommended \$35 million with a budget estimate of \$70 million.

Then there was \$7 million for administration. The House allowed \$5 million. There was an item of \$47.8 million in the Senate, and that was allowed at \$25 million, so that there is \$50 million provided for research and development in place of the \$70 million. That means a total of \$80 million. Now, that is quite a lot of money for a new agency just getting started, and it was felt that was all that they could use.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Well, did the committee hear from the Administrator or did it hear from any of the committees?

Mr. TABER. The Senate did hear from the Administrator, and we went over everything with the Senators. We spent considerable time on that yesterday afternoon.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Well, now, I have been through the hearings on this question of establishing this new agency. And, we have, as I said before argued and argued and complained about the United States not moving fast enough in the development of space exploration. And it seems to me that with the new Administrator, just appointed and confirmed, who is ambitious and interested in the development of this whole program, we are limiting him to a very small sum of money.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman interested in more money for research? Is that it? Now, we increased the Senate allowance from \$35 million to \$50 million.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The report I am reading from indicates this.

Mr. TABER. The Senate committee allowance was \$35 million, and that is all that they figured they should allow. And, we went \$50 million on it. Frankly, I do not think they did very bad by us.

Mr. McDONOUGH. You reduced it from the request of \$70 million to \$50 million.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state very briefly how much this bill is increased over the bill as it left the House?

Mr. TABER. This bill is above the House bill by about \$552 million.

Mr. GROSS. Half a billion dollars plus.

Mr. TABER. Yes; \$463 million of that is for items that the House never considered at all, and we did not have any estimates of it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inform the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations that Dr. Dryden came before the committee and made a request of \$47.8 million for this new equipment, for this new science laboratory and for the new launching platform at Wallops Island. And, he said that was a modest request. He said he needed far more than that. But, he modestly requested that amount to start with. Now, if we are to compete with Russia, we have to give these people the equipment to do it. I think the request has been reduced to a minimum of our requirements, and it is going to indicate that we are not moving as fast as we should in this space program.

Mr. TABER. The committee of conference decided that they would give \$25 million for that item. I thought they had done pretty well for the space agency. Frankly, I think that these figures are more than we should allow.

There are three amendments in disagreement that it is proposed, as I understand, by the chairman of the House committee of conference to move to further insist on in our disagreement with them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do those amendments apply to these items?

Mr. TABER. No. They are amendments in disagreement. There are no amendments in disagreement with ref-

erence to the space agency. Those things will be disposed of and discussed as we get to them.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a member of the committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed, as is the gentleman from California [Mr. McDonough], with the reductions which have been made in the budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. However, I am even more concerned about the inclusion of a provision in the bill by the other body which is designated here as Amendment No. 36.

As I understand, that amendment was originally submitted to the majority leader in the other body by the staff of their so-called Space Committee and recommended to him by them. Through his efforts that amendment was included in the military construction appropriation bill. In conference it was stricken. However, the same amendment was offered to the supplemental appropriation bill by the majority leader and in conference on this bill it is included as a legislative rider.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That amendment has to be in technical disagreement. The House conferees agreed to move to recede and concur, but it is in technical disagreement. If it is desired to consider it it should be done at that time.

Mr. FORD. May I just say a word or two about it at this time because I think it is very bad legislation both as to form and substance. It reads as follows:

No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency unless previously authorized by legislation hereinafter enacted by the Congress.

This provision is completely and totally contrary to the basic space legislation which this Congress enacted not more than a month ago. That was good legislation. It was, I think, carefully considered and very ably presented to the House by the Majority Leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. McCormack].

We included in that basic legislation a provision in reference to appropriations which in effect said this, that the space agency has to get special authorization legislation for any construction that costs more than \$250,000 or for any land acquisition. I think requiring special authorizing legislation in those instances is sound. The House and the Senate enacted that legislation. Within a month after its enactment, we come along with a legislative rider on an appropriation bill and say that from here on in NASA must come up here and get an authorization bill each year for any of their activities, for the construction of facilities, for the acquisition of land and for their day-to-day operating expenses.

In effect, what you are telling the people of this new agency is that they have to spend about half their time up here first before an authorization committee and then before an appropriation com-

mittee to get any money whatsoever for their operations. Instead of Dr. Glennan, the Director, and Dr. Dryden, his administrative assistant, spending the maximum amount of time in running their agency and trying to give us the needed impetus to get ahead or stay ahead of the Russians, they are going to be up here justifying every penny they get for operations and construction before four committees of the Congress. I think it is a deplorable requirement. I want to indicate my complete disagreement with this provision.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to associate myself emphatically with the gentleman from Michigan. I know of no precedent for this kind of legislation. Here we are going to require this agency, if this becomes law, to make a presentation on every little shed they want to build, or anything else, first before a committee to get an authorization and then before the Appropriations Committee. It was for the very purpose of avoiding this that we put this limitation in the basic legislation. It seems to me important that we vote down and disagree with this amendment. It has no purpose except to make work for a committee, or perhaps its staff. Further, it might be an extremely serious thing to our own national defense. This agency is going to be concerned with a great many matters that are vital to the future welfare of this country. To hamstring them this way is a great mistake. I hope the House will not recede and concur in this amendment, which is without precedent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I also want to associate myself with the gentleman from Michigan in his protest. As I indicated while I was on the floor, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, during the hearings on this space administration we heard from a lot of very capable and intelligent people, who stated that you could not have a year-to-year appropriation program on a thing of this sort and develop an adequate program in research and development for space exploration. Is not that true?

Mr. FORD. I am greatly concerned with the hamstringing that this amendment will impose on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I think that agreeing with this will hinder and roadblock their day-to-day operations. It means before they can spend a nickel for the pay of a clerk in the lowest grade they will have to come up here and get an authorization on an annual basis from a legislative committee. In addition this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and I think it is wrong both as to form and as to substance.

Mr. McDONOUGH. How, for instance, are we going to continue on a program of research on cosmic rays or satellites, for civilian purposes, not military purposes, where it requires research and development for months and months and

perhaps a year, if we come up to a point where we have to come back to a committee and say, "Well, we have gone so far, and we ask for a few more million dollars." This is a ridiculous provision.

Mr. FORD. Under this provision they will have to come up before Congressional committees four times in every session.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that the language which you had a great deal to do with in the space agency authorization bill was good language. It is the only type of authorization language that is necessary and should be insisted upon here in the House today. The unnecessary language of this amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill was introduced in the Senate as an amendment not only to the supplemental appropriation bill but also to the military construction appropriations bill, by the Majority Leader of the Senate. I believe this language will hamstring the activities of this new agency. It is indeed regrettable that it was included in this bill. It must be deleted from this legislation today.

Mr. FORD. This language in my opinion will be detrimental to the basic objectives of our research and development programs in space exploration and astronautics. If there is ever to be any blame in the future for failures or slow downs, this kind of language will have to bear a large share of the burden.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I, too, was concerned about this language when I found it in the Senate discussion of the matter.

Does the gentleman agree with me that this is in direct contradiction to the language which we placed in the original authorization bill for the agency?

Mr. FORD. It seems to me it is about 95 percent in opposition to the basic legislation for the space agency. The Congress did set out certain requirements where NASA had to come back to get special authorization, but there was nothing in that act which would hamstring NASA to this extent.

Mr. SISK. I, too, am concerned. I have been attempting to find out what the status of this is. In other words, whether or not the conferees agreed and whether or not it is going to be a matter of voting down the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. Does the gentleman understand that to be the procedure?

Mr. FORD. As I understand it, we can fight the motion to recede and concur, and if we are successful the bill goes back to conference, in effect, insisting that the position of the House be sustained. I hope we will take such action.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, there is one thing I would like to make clear. The vote on the conference report itself has nothing to do with this or any of these other items in disagreement.

Mr. FORD. As I understand it, then, we vote on the conference report first and then take up the individual motions to recede and concur.

Mr. TABER. They will be taken up in numerical order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am also greatly concerned about the reductions which were made in the actual obligation authority made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The total budget request was \$122 million. The agency was given in this conference report \$80 million. The reduction is over \$40 million.

We have heard a great deal of criticism about the executive branch of the Government with reference to our missile and our space programs. In fact, after the failure on last Sunday of the first lunar probe, certain people, Members of this body, and others, were somewhat critical of the failure in that effort despite the fact that it was an experiment where the possibility of success was at best 50-50. I fail to understand both as to the substance and as to the politics, if you want to say it, why some in this Congress after being so critical of the administration should now come up and cut the national space agency appropriation by about one-third. The reduction in funds cannot be justified on the facts. It certainly is not going to be a sound position to defend in the political arena.

I am disappointed because I think this appropriation, requested by the President, would have given to the space agency an opportunity to move ahead and to do a real job. I certainly hope that a means or a method can be found to remedy the error of this reduction by the conference committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield for a question?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. THOMAS. I admire my colleague very much, but I do hope he will calm his fears as to the crippling of this agency. We looked into their request for funds carefully and, I might say, prayerfully. I doubt if it can be said with any degree of accuracy that their plans are firm. What the committee did was this. It is pretty well agreed on both sides of the table, and between both bodies, that there was not the slightest disposition to hamstring the agency. All that we wanted to do was to see the agency get started right and get started on the right foot and come January, we will take another look at the thing.

As a matter of fact my guess is they have got more money than they can possibly spend. Their plans are not firm, and I doubt if they know today just exactly what they are going to do. They cannot know by virtue of the "animal" itself; it is impossible.

Mr. FORD. May I reply by saying that there are many highly competent and qualified people, technically and otherwise, in this area who have been dismayed that the budget submitted by the administration was not greater in this program.

I think this budget as submitted by the administration was reasonable under the circumstances, but I am personally very

unhappy and dismayed that the reduction has been made by the conferees.

Mr. THOMAS. They have worlds of money to use between now and January; they cannot possibly obligate all the money that is carried. We can always take another look at it, and in January if they need more money they will get it. Let us start them out right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Money is one thing, but the legislation that is in this bill is another, and if amendment No. 36 which says that no appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress, is left in we are going to hamstring the agency even before January 1.

Mr. FORD. In the meantime you are losing 4 months' valuable time and 4 months in the missile and space field at this point is critical. I cannot understand how this Congress is going to sit here and accept these reductions.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if these conferees in the House here would generally agree with this kind of legislation and want to see this space agency progress, we should vote to eliminate this amendment and insist on the House position on amendment No. 36.

Mr. FORD. Certainly, the amendment should be deleted. We should insist on the House position on amendment No. 36. In addition I strongly disapprove of the reductions in NASA's budget.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disturbed when I learned that yesterday the House conferees knocked out the Senate-approved \$100,000 for planning work on the East Branch Reservoir and \$100,000 for planning work on the Hall Meadow Reservoir that would have afforded flood protection for the city of Torrington, Conn. These planning funds had been recommended by both the Rivers and Harbors Congress and the United States Army Corps of Engineers as well as the United States Bureau of the Budget.

It was due to the great diligence of Senators PURTELL and BUSH that this \$200,000 item was inserted in the supplemental appropriations bill on the Senate side; and I know that it will be a great disappointment to the people of Torrington when they hear that these urgently needed planning funds were deleted by the House conferees.

Torrington suffered terribly in the disastrous floods of 1955 and nothing has been done to prevent a recurrence of another disaster in the future. Furthermore, the modest request for planning funds was based on the careful surveys

and sound engineering recommendations of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to call attention to amendment No. 60 which covers funds for grants to States to enable them to administer the unemployment compensation and employment security programs.

The total amount of \$325,600,000 which will be available with the supplemental amount of \$20,600,000 recommended for this grant-to-States item is the same as was approved by both the House and the Senate. There is no disagreement on the total amount of the appropriation.

However, this total amount is divided between a base appropriation with which the State employment security agencies are required to perform the workloads associated with a given level of insured unemployment and a contingency fund to be used when workloads exceed those in the base appropriation and for other purposes specified in the bill.

The House approved a base appropriation of \$305,600,000 for the workloads related to an average of 2,900,000 per week. The Department of Labor appealed this action to the Senate. In this appeal they made two points which had not been made clear to the House. These two points were that in 1958, when insured unemployment averaged 2,200,000 per week, it had cost the State employment security agencies \$295 million to operate and that to process the same workload in 1959 would require \$301,400,000. The additional \$6,400,000 is needed to pay for mandatory cost increases which were not paid in 1958. The largest of these items is \$3,500,000 for postage due to the recent increase in postage rates passed by the Congress. This amount was not in the estimate as it was submitted by the President because the new postage law had not been passed when the estimates were prepared.

The Senate approved a base appropriation of \$301,400,000 which it considered to be adequate for an insured unemployment average of 2,200,000 per week, the 1958 experience. After considering the new facts presented to the Senate, I have come to the conclusion that a base appropriation of \$301,400,000 for a weekly average of 2,200,000 insured unemployment is not unreasonable.

However, the conferees have now recommended that the State employment security agencies be required to handle 2,500,000 claims per week for \$301,400,000. This is tantamount to saying to the agencies which pay unemployment compensation and provide employment service for millions of our people, "Do as much work as you did in 1958 but you must do it with 4,000 fewer people." This will mean delays in benefit payments, errors in the processing of claims as well as heavy layoffs in the State and local offices of the State employment security agencies. Even worse it will mean layoffs at a time when every effort needs to be made to pay benefits promptly to unemployed workers and when efforts to place workers in jobs should be intensified.

I also would like to make the point that this is not coming out of the Federal Treasury at all. It is paid for by a three-tenths of 1 percent assessment paid by the employers for the administration of these programs in all the States. I have talked this over with the members of the subcommittee, including the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee who is on his feet now. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island in what he has said and I believe he will agree with me that the language that is contained in this report is more restrictive than the language in the House bill.

As the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated, the House and Senate approved \$325,600,000 which includes the supplemental amount of \$20,600,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.

The State employment security agencies are faced with a problem because they are required by the conference report to perform workloads related to an insured unemployment of 2,500,000 a week with the base appropriation of \$301,400,000. In 1958 the States processed an average of 2,200,000 claims per week at a cost of \$295 million. In 1959 there are about \$6,400,000 worth of mandatory costs which will have to be paid even if the workload remains the same. The largest of these mandatory costs is \$3,500,000 for postage due to the recent increase in rates passed by the Congress. This amount was not in the estimate submitted by the President.

The State employment security agencies were able to pay unemployment benefits fairly promptly in 1958 because they diverted employees who normally performed employment service and tax collection functions and also took numerous short cuts. However, by any standard, service to the public was at what must be considered minimum levels. If the States are now requested to take an average of 300,000 more claims per week with the same number of employers that they had in 1958 it is obvious that there will be delays in benefit payments, substantial errors in the processing of claims and heavy layoffs in the State and local offices of the State employment security agencies. These layoffs will come at a time when the State agencies need to make every effort to pay benefits promptly and accurately to unemployed workers and when their employment services should make every effort to place workers in jobs. It is not good business to decrease job placement efforts because workers will remain unemployed longer under such conditions.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Two or three things have happened, since we held hearings on the bill, that increase the cost of the administration of this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Rhode Island is one of the

most expert parliamentarians in the House. He understands the procedure as well as or better than anybody I know. It is not necessary for me to remind the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that this is not subject to change. This has not been brought back in disagreement. This is a conference report and the conference report must be voted up or down, however necessary it may seem to be to make some revision at this late hour. It is utterly impossible to do that unless you vote down the conference report or recommit it. The gentleman from New York, I think, is familiar with the situation.

Mr. TABER. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has probably stated the facts correctly. However, I think we could correct it by some sort of communication from the chairman of the two Appropriations Committees a little later on, if we have to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that although the present parliamentary situation is as described by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as one of the conferees on this bill, I entirely agree with the opening statement of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. I am hopeful that in connection with the final appropriation bill, which will be the mutual security bill, something will be done to cure the situation the gentleman has described.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is discussing a matter not before the House. There is nothing that can be done to change this item except to vote down the conference report or recommit it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I knew at the time I rose on my feet I could not do anything about this matter today without voting down the conference report. I do not want to ask that the conference report be voted down, but I thought we might get agreement of some kind with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the ranking minority member, whereby we could straighten out this inequity before this Congress adjourns. This, in my opinion, is a mistake that has been made by the conference committee, and it should be straightened out, even though we find ourselves in a difficult parliamentary situation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I spoke to the State director in Illinois, and he says as far as the operation of his program is concerned it would be better if the appropriation were voted down because of the limitation agreed on by the conferees. He says he does not know how he is going to carry on his work with the limitation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought we might be able to get an agreement with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

ations [Mr. CANNON], along the line suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. The President just yesterday sent some additional requests for supplemental appropriations to Congress. This request is printed as Senate Document No. 117. I understand that these appropriations, if approved, will likely be included as a separate title in the mutual security appropriation bill. It would be entirely possible, and in my opinion most desirable, that the Senate include, either in the bill or their report, language which would correct this situation. It would, of course, be my hope and expectation that the House would agree with any such correction that the Senate might make. I reiterate that, because of the parliamentary situation, it was not my intention to try to get this matter corrected today but rather to secure an agreement with the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member to use their influence in securing correction in connection with the remaining appropriation bill now pending in the Senate.

Mr. LAIRD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I just wanted to say that I wholeheartedly concur in the gentleman's suggestion and hope that it can be carried out.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

This is not fair to the States, it is not fair to the program. It is not money that comes out of the Federal Treasury at all. Again I say this three-tenths of 1 percent is paid by the employers to administer the program in the States. It does not belong to the Treasury.

I wonder if the chairman would accept language to change and modify this if the Senate agrees to modify it in connection with the supplemental items now pending?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to embarrass the gentleman at all, but the gentleman's subcommittee reported out a more restrictive figure than this. That is what we were going on. Their report contained a figure of 2.9 million average insured unemployment to use as a base in determining the use of contingency funds, and the Senate report contained a figure of 2.2 million. The provision which the subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island is the very effective and experienced chairman, sent over to the Senate contained the figure of 2.9 million. But, the Senate had 2.2 million, so we compromised at 2.5 million. We compromised at a more favorable figure than the gentleman's subcommittee recommended. Of course, it had to be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate. We were in unanimous agreement. There was no objection on either side. We adopted a more generous figure than the gentleman's committee recommended.

Mr. FOGARTY. Just to straighten out the record, the subcommittee of which I am chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], is the ranking member, did vote this out, but since the time we acted changes have

taken place; costs have increased. We passed an increase in postage rates, which means an additional \$4 million which we had no knowledge of at that time. Rents have increased since we acted on the bill. And, there have been other increases since our subcommittee held hearings on this.

Mr. CANNON. The subcommittee did not call it to the attention of the conferees, the subcommittee did not call it to the attention of the House, the subcommittee did not call it to the attention of the full committee, so we proceeded on the assumption that the figure that the gentleman's subcommittee recommended was the desirable figure. We had no information, no suggestion, that the conditions had changed or the gentleman's subcommittee had changed or the gentleman himself had changed, so we went ahead on the assumption that the figure he gave was the final figure, and we got even a more favorable figure than the gentleman recommended.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not so, because the Senate amendment also reduces the base appropriation by \$4,200,000 below the House bill and places that amount in the contingency fund. The House conferees agreed to that amendment and then compromised on the number of insured unemployment to be used as a base. So we have a more unfavorable bill, and the record shows it. When you pass this conference report you tell them to handle 2.5 million claims a week with practically the same money they had last year to handle 2.2 million. It means that they are going to be short by 4,000 employees of being able to carry on the work on last year's standards. It does not add up at all. When we have millions of people unemployed it is no time to lay off people so that their claims cannot even be handled properly.

Mr. CANNON. The fact remains that the House managers secured a more favorable figure than the gentleman recommended. And it is also a fact that the total appropriations for this activity for 1959 is \$75 million more than was appropriated just 2 years ago for 1957.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], in the position that he takes on this amendment underlying his objection to the agreement that an average of 2,500,000 insured unemployment shall be used as the base in determining the availability of contingency funds for use by the States.

This language is too restrictive. It forces the already overburdened employees of State employment offices charged with the duties under the unemployment compensation fund to carry a heavier burden with the same amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, from experiences in my own District, and I am sure that similar

conditions exist throughout the Nation, the State unemployment insurance offices have been taxed to capacity by the great number of unemployed in their respective areas. This has occasioned long lines and interminable hours of waiting by those who come in to sign for benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Often times it is an exhausting and frustrating ordeal. Some of the offices are not equipped with sufficient facilities or space to give the applicants a decent place to wait or rest until their turn comes for their interviews with the clerks.

A failure to provide more funds for administration or to cut the workload will result in greater inconveniences than the existing intolerable conditions.

Those who have suffered the calamity of the loss of their jobs and face little prospect of employment are entitled to better treatment than they now receive as they apply for their benefits. And by better treatment, I mean adequate facilities and sufficient personnel to properly handle the great numbers of applicants that daily visit these offices.

The responsibility rests with the State governments to secure facilities that can adequately handle the many people who apply. The Federal Government has a responsibility of making available sufficient money to employ enough trained and efficient personnel. I hope that the Senate will take favorable action on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a news story from the Springfield Daily News on Monday, August 18, under a three-column headline "DES Critics Swamp Sponsor of Petition" which underscores my position in this matter.

DES CRITICS SWAMP SPONSOR OF PETITION

A Newland Street woman who got 101 waiting claimants to sign an on-the-spot petition against local Division of Employment Security methods today had to call for help.

Mrs. Marie Roberti, who contended that the Worthington Street office has set up a "breadline" treatment of claimants, today said she has been deluged with approximately 70 telephone calls since Friday when the petition was signed as the claimant stood in line.

The petition organizer said that she has listened to all kinds of complaints from people against DES.

Since the telephone has not stopped ringing, according to the harried woman, she has asked that complaints be referred to State representatives since she is unable to keep up with the number of irate calls coming in to her.

At the same time she contended that the long lines do not just occur on Friday as DES officials contend, holding that she found a line outside the office today.

She has sent out her petition urging investigation of conditions here to Governor Furecolo and asked State representatives to keep an eye on its course in Boston.

Eugene Sweeney, DES manager here, said the lines on Friday will be offered space inside the 339 Worthington Street office, but he thought they would be better off standing outside since the facility just doesn't have the room to accommodate a large turnout.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, numbered as follows: 9, 16, 20, 25, 29, 40, 48, 56, 62, 65, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 118, 125, and 126.

I am excluding from the motion which is at the desk, amendment No. 36.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it clearly understood that in the motion to be offered amendment No. 36 is excluded?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, that will come up for a separate vote.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 13, insert:

"War Shipping Administration liquidation

"Notwithstanding the last proviso under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1959, the funds made available under said head shall remain available until June 30, 1959, for payment of benefits to disabled seamen under crew life and injury and second seamen's war risk insurance policies and for payments under the act of September 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 758): *Provided*, That after these payments shall have been made, the unexpended balance remaining in this account is hereby rescinded and shall be covered into the Treasury."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 9, line 8, insert:

"General provision

"Subparagraph (a) of section 606 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1959, is amended by deleting '\$245' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$265.'"

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 16, line 21, insert:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

"Extraordinary alterations and repairs

"For extraordinary alterations, repairs, furniture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and grounds, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding any other provisions of this or any other act, \$100,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 18, line 4, insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Translation of publications and scientific cooperation

"For purchase of foreign currencies, pursuant to section 104 (k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, for disseminating scientific and technological information and supporting scientific activities overseas, \$5,100,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 19, line 15, insert:

"Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, authorizing the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District, \$1,020,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3259, 85th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 24, line 1, insert:

"Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief

"For an additional amount for 'Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief,' \$1,300,000 to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 26, line 11, strike out lines 11 through 16, and insert:

"For an additional amount, \$50,000 and not to exceed \$20,000 and not to exceed \$25,000 of the appropriations under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Acts, 1957 and 1958 (Public Laws 573, 84th Cong. and 85-77) respectively, shall be available during the current fiscal year for reimbursements to the District of Columbia for benefit payments made for those fiscal years pursuant to the act of August 21, 1957 (71 Stat. 399): *Provided*, That any costs in excess of the amounts stated herein shall be reimbursed from this appropriation for the current fiscal year."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 29, line 15, insert:

"HUDSON-CHAMPLAIN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 8, 1958 (Public Law 85-614), \$50,000, to remain available until March 1, 1960."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 31, line 16, insert:

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1958, for 'Salaries and expenses', for payment of retroactive pay increases granted by administrative action for the maintenance and administrative staff, comparable to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-462, approved June 20, 1958), \$15,000."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 32, line 3, insert:

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1958, for 'Salaries and expenses', for payment of retroactive pay increases granted by administrative action, comparable to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-462, approved June 20, 1958), \$182,500."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 36, line 2, insert:

"Committee on rules and administration

"For compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the Senate Manual, \$200, which amount may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States."

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 36, line 12, insert:

"Miscellaneous items

"For an additional amount for miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1958, \$50,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries, officers and employees, Senate,' fiscal year 1958."

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 36, line 17, insert:

"Stationery (revolving fund)

"For an additional amount for stationery for committees of the Senate, \$300, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 36, line 21, insert:

"For payment to Katharine McVey, widow of William E. McVey, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, \$22,500."

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 37, line 8, insert:

"CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

"Extension of additional Senate Office Building site

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to carry out the provisions of Public Law 85-591, 85th Congress, relating to the acquisition of property in square 725 in the District of Columbia, including necessary incidental expenses, \$625,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 38, line 1, insert:

"LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

"Preservation of early American motion pictures

"For expenses necessary to enable the Librarian of Congress to provide for the conversion to safety base film of the George Kleine collection of nitrate film, and the paper prints of early American motion pictures now in the custody of the Library, \$60,000."

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 38, line 8, insert:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Subsection (b) of section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

"After the words 'House of Representatives' the first time they appear, insert 'and the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives and the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate.'"

Senate amendment No. 97: Page 40, line 5, insert: *"Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated herein, \$2 million shall be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation."

Senate amendment No. 98: Page 40, line 8, insert: *"Provided further*, That \$3 million of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available only upon the enactment of S. 4273 or H. R. 13749 for research and development costs in connection with agreements for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community."

Senate amendment No. 118: Page 45, line 19, insert:

"Contribution for annuity benefits

"For reimbursement (not heretofore made), pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 21, 1957 (71 Stat. 399), and effective in accordance with section 8 of such act, to the District of Columbia, on a monthly basis, for benefit payments made from revenues of the District of Columbia to or for members of the White House Police force and such members of the United States Secret Service Division as have been or may hereafter become entitled to benefits under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, such amounts as hereafter may be necessary: *Provided*, That hereafter the appropriation granted under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 638), shall not be available."

Senate amendment No. 125: Page 48, line 12, insert:

"Sec. 1601. The provisions of title II of Public Law 85-472, approved June 30, 1958, shall apply also to costs in the fiscal year 1957 and 1958 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to Public Law 85-584 and 85- and 85- : *Provided*, That for the purposes of this paragraph the limitation for the warranting of appropriations and transfer-

ring of appropriations contained in section 206 (b) of title II of Public Law 85-472 shall be extended to September 30, 1958: *Provided further*, That the portion of this paragraph applicable to teachers and pension increases for policemen, firemen, and their widows and orphans shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 13132 and H. R. 7450, or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 126: Page 48, line 25, insert:

"SEC. 1602. No part of the funds appropriated in this (or any other) act shall be used to pay (1) any person, firm, or corporation, or any combinations of persons, firms, or corporations, to conduct a study or to plan when and how or in what circumstances the Government of the United States should surrender this country and its people to any foreign power, (2) the salary or compensation of any employee or official of the Government of the United States who proposes or contracts or who has entered into contracts for the making of studies or plans for the surrender by the Government of the United States of this country and its people to any foreign power in any event or under any circumstances."

Mr. CANNON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be disposed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 16, 20, 25, 29, 40, 48, 56, 62, 65, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 118, 125, and 126, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 8, insert "of which \$1 million shall be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and diseases to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$1,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 25, insert: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used for the land acquisition for, or the construction of, an access road to such airport which when completed would directly connect with the George Washington Memorial Parkway."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment

of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used for land acquisition for an access road to such airport until the Secretary of Commerce has made a report to the Appropriations Committees of Congress as to the need of an access road as a necessary approach to said airport which will, when completed, directly connect with the George Washington Memorial Parkway."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 7, line 18, insert the following:

"Salaries and Expenses"

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,775,000, and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed \$11,700,000 from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed \$825,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided*, That the amount authorized for transfer from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans: *Provided further*, That 15 per centum of the amount authorized to be transferred from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to carry out the business loan program: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3651, 85th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,500,000; and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed \$11,060,000 from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed \$825,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided*, That the amount authorized for transfer from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount

(not exceeding \$500,000) as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans: *Provided further*, That 10 percent of the amount authorized to be transferred from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to carry out the business loan program: *Provided further*, That \$1 million of the amount herein appropriated shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3651, 85th Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 8, line 19, insert the following:

"Revolving fund"

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitations, \$215,000,000: *Provided*, That \$50,000,000 of this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3651, 85th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$215,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$200,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 17, line 4, insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses"

"For an additional amount for necessary expenses of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, \$2,915,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purposes set forth under the appropriations granted for the fiscal year 1959, under the headings 'Salaries and expenses', Office of Defense Mobilization, and 'Operations', Federal Civil Defense Administration."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter dropped by said amendment insert:

"Salaries and expenses"

"For an additional amount for necessary expenses of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purposes set forth under the appropriations granted for the fiscal year 1959, under the headings 'Salaries and expenses', Office of Defense Mobilization, and 'Operations', Federal Civil Defense Administration."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 17, line 12, insert the following:

"Federal contributions"

"For an additional amount for 'Federal contributions' including financial contributions to the States pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1958, shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 17, line 20, insert the following:

"Emergency supplies and equipment"

"For an additional amount for 'Emergency supplies and equipment', including procurement, as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$2 million: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1958 shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Emergency supplies and equipment"

"For an additional amount for 'Emergency supplies and equipment', including procurement, as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$2 million."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: page 22, line 19, insert the following: "No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this motion, and I should like to have time to discuss the opposition to this proposal. Could the gentleman yield to those of us who do oppose it 30 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the matter I discussed earlier. It involves the provision which was offered to the supplemental appropriation bill on the floor of the other body. As I read the

debate on the military construction appropriation bill on the floor of the other body, I find this statement by the author of the amendment and I quote:

I have talked with members of the staff of the space committee which met this morning in connection with the question of authorization. On behalf of that committee, I offer an amendment.

That was this amendment. Apparently, this particular amendment had no real consideration by the appropriations committee in the other body. Apparently it was sponsored by the staff of the space committee in the other body. It completely repeals the basic law which the Congress approved less than a month ago for the establishment of the Space Agency.

Here is a copy of the basic law. We included a provision, section 307 (a) and (b) which said, in effect, that there should be a special authorization for any construction project that involved more than \$250,000. In addition, it said that there should be a special authorization for any land acquisition.

By the inclusion of that provision in the basic space legislation, we said that the NASA shall have authority for research and development just like we give to the Army, Navy, and Air Force in continuing appropriations without an annual authorization. This new agency is going to handle matters of equal importance to our missile program. I fail to see why we should require this agency to have an annual authorization bill.

We do not require the Defense Department and we do not require any one of the many other agencies of the Federal Government involved in this kind of work to have an annual authorization. The practical effect of this amendment will be to hamstring, to slow down, and curtail the acceleration of our missile and satellite programs, particularly our civilian or nonmilitary efforts on research and development for satellites.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. That is the very thing we are trying to avoid at this particular time in the face of such conditions as exist today. We are trying to avoid any slowdown that would be brought about by any such procedure as this. That is why I support wholeheartedly the position that the gentleman from Michigan has taken. But, can the gentleman answer this question for me, and I know that he does not know what goes on in the minds of the members of the staff of the other body, but I would like to know one good reason for this language being put in this bill like this. I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. FORD. I have been trying to recollect whether there is any other similar agency that has to come up here once a year to get an authorization for research and development. I do not know of such an agency. The only annual authorization bill with which I am familiar is our mutual security bill. We do not require the Army, the Navy, and Air Force to come in here and get an authorization to do their research and development work on missiles. We do not

require any other agency that I know of to get such annual authority.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am going to suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent that this amendment No. 36 be reported by the Clerk so that the membership may understand just what it means.

Mr. FORD. As I understand the parliamentary situation, and I have checked with the Parliamentarian, if we want to reject the inclusion of this amendment in the law, we must vote down the motion to recede and concur. If we vote down the motion to recede and concur, then a motion can be offered, and I have such a motion at the Clerk's desk, to move that the House insist on its disagreement with the amendment of the Senate numbered 36.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but I think that if the amendment was reported by the Clerk as it is here in the bill, the membership would be able to see just exactly what they will be voting on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read amendment No. 36, which is in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 36: Page 22, line 19, insert: "No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress."

Mr. FORD. May I repeat again: In the basic space legislation which was approved unanimously by this Congress less than a month ago, we took care of the authorization problems which require special action by the Congress. This provision in this bill completely nullifies the provision in the law which we passed 30 days ago.

If this language which is in disagreement is included, before the Space Agency can hire 1 clerk, 1 single clerk to do some typing, they have to come to Congress and get an authorization by the Congress on an annual basis. If they want to make one contract with a university or a private research organization for the most important thing that is to be done in satellite work, they have got to get an annual authorization by the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays] and I were in England in the late summer of 1944 when Hitler sent across his first V-2's. That was just 2 months or so after our Expeditionary Force had left England to land in Normandy. It was said in all

quarters that had Hitler been able to launch his V-2 just 4 months earlier, he might have won the war. Are we here today to take chances on 4, 6, 8 months, or a year of delay in this most important field?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is so right, as is the gentleman from Michigan—if the gentleman will yield; and while the gentleman from Michigan said this involves civilian advances in this field, yet between the civilian and the military the difference is so little that delay might have a very adverse effect on our national defense effort if these people have to come up here on every single item and ask an authorization before they can get an appropriation.

Mr. FORD. We all know that the authorization legislation for the mutual-security program and the appropriation bill for the mutual-security program are the slowest-moving proposals in the Congress each year.

It means that if you require the Space Agency to go through this tortuous process you are going to hold back a lot longer than necessary the effort this country is making in the satellite and missile field.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise in opposition to our Appropriations Committee because certainly they do an outstanding job and they do a lot of hard work. However, in this particular amendment under discussion here I wish to endorse everything that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has said. I feel that it definitely represents a danger to an agency that I think can be the most effective force in the immediate future that we have created in a great many years.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to make just one slight correction. This amendment is not an amendment of the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee; it was offered on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader at the request of the staff of the Senate Space Committee.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the correction made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know, of course, that it was not proposed by the Appropriations Committee of the House, but that the particular language under discussion came about from action in the other body.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to concur in what the gentleman is saying, and I want to point out to the House that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], has won a reputation here for a healthy respect for the taxpayer's dollar and a very great alertness to our national defense needs.

It seems to me the significant thing here is that while those who concocted this language did not intend to hamstring our efforts, the fact remains every

member of the committee of this House which dealt with this urgent problem, Democrats and Republicans alike, have stated here that this language, if it survives, will hamstring us in this missile and satellite field.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution. I am in complete agreement with him and that is the point in my taking the floor.

I would like to discuss for a moment the action taken by your select Committee on Astronautics and Space during the last 5 or 6 months. That committee, under the able leadership of our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], considered this particular problem at great length. The language which was written into the original authorizing bill setting up the new Space Agency was gone over with a fine-tooth comb. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], and the other gentlemen on my side will agree that that is true and that we did, from time to time, make some changes in the language. We realized the importance of permitting this agency to act quickly and expeditiously to do the things that were necessary, realizing that they must have freedom of action; yet at the same time we were concerned with protecting the taxpayer's dollar, and we did set up provisions providing for authorization, for the purchase of substantial real estate, equipment, or buildings where there was a substantial amount of money involved.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman will remember that we spent hours and hours in discussing this matter, whether the \$250 million was the correct amount or whether we should have any limitation. We went over this with a fine-tooth comb.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman will agree also that one of those of the committee who was most insistent that this agency have everything possible to step up its program to meet the Russian threat was the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK]. If he were here this morning I think he would be down in the well of the House supporting the same question.

Mr. SISK. I may say to the gentleman I thoroughly agree with him. That is one of the reasons I am down here, although I feel my inability to carry the ball to the extent that he has done before the House in connection with this new agency. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for the work he has done.

Now, let us not do something that will tend to tie the hands and destroy the effectiveness of this new agency which we are all depending on to win for us not only a propaganda victory but to win for us some real achievement in the space field and in the field of aeronautics, in

a field which will have a material effect on the national defense of our country.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me discuss this briefly. There is nothing partisan about this matter. We are all together in the same boat. One of my able and distinguished friends raised another point that there was not enough money in here. But let me confine my remarks to this language and let me read it to you:

No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.

Now, let us see what the history of this language is. This language was put in by the Senate. It is my understanding that the very able Senate minority leader offered the amendment on the Senate floor, and it was adopted by a big vote. If I am in error, I stand corrected, but that is my understanding.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. THOMAS. By all means, for a correction.

Mr. FORD. The amendment was offered by the majority leader. There was no rollcall. It was accepted by a voice vote in the other body.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, did I make an untrue statement?

Mr. FORD. You said, "minority leader."

Mr. THOMAS. I beg your pardon. I mean the majority leader, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas.

Well, now, why did they adopt this language? Let us look at it. The good old legislative committee of this House, than which there are no finer men in this body, virtually gave away all the power of the House of Representatives. To whom? To the committee or to the House or to the Senate or to the Congress? No. To the executive branch of the Government. And, I do not mean to be partisan; I do not care if he is a Democrat or a Republican. The legislative committees of the House and Senate gave away, gentlemen, the authority of the House and the Senate. They gave it to the executive, and the only way you are going to get some of that authority back is by this language, and, gentlemen, that is true.

Furthermore, let us see how many big scientific agencies we have in this Government. Now I am talking sense to you. You have the Atomic Energy Commission. You have spent almost \$50 billion on that agency. And, did you give away your authority there like you did here? Of course you did not. Then we have the National Science Foundation that is costing you around \$100 million this year. And, they are nothing but the finest scientists in the world. Did you give away your authority there? No. Do you require them to come and justify their money? Do

you know how much money we have given this crowd this year for research alone? In this bill you wanted \$182 million, and your committee gave them \$150 million for research alone plus another \$25 million for real estate plus another \$5 million for salaries, and in addition to that they had from the NACA another \$80 million. And, the House of Representatives says to these agencies every year: "Submit your program. How much money do you want?" And, we give it to them. You are not being unduly harsh with this crowd. What is wrong with them coming over and letting the Congress determine? After all, we do the legislating.

Gentlemen, we are making a mountain out of a molehill. This amendment protects what? The authority and the prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the Congress; that is all it does. Is there anything wrong if they come in here and submit their requests? Every agency does that every year. Two hundred and fifty million dollars or \$300 million have already been justified. What is wrong with that, gentlemen?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Has the gentleman read this language that is in dispute and that we are about to vote upon? Reading the language in the last line "by legislation hereinafter enacted by the Congress." Now, that language is a veto, if you please, a repealer amendment to the action that this Congress approved a short time ago.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there anything wrong in the Congress legislating? Whose duty is it to legislate, the Executive's or that of the legislative branch?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Congress should understand just what this situation is. I am taking this time because I feel that the conferees made a mistake in agreeing to move to recede and concur in this language. If their language had been of the character that simply meant that they should receive no appropriations that had not been authorized by previous action of the Congress, if the word "hereafter" were out, I would not mind at all, and I do not think anybody else would because then these people could come up with an annual estimate or any other estimate that they might have to submit in between. But to undertake to repeal all of this language, to tell this agency which has just been set up that they cannot do anything or have any application for an appropriation in a regular annual way, the way other agencies in the Government proceed, I think would be a mistake.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Of course, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force in their research

and development programs do not get annual legislative authority before they ask for an appropriation. They have the authority to come up and ask the Committee on Appropriations on an annual basis for research and development funds. This language that was included in the conference report makes the Space Agency go through the Congressional process twice each year and appear before four committees annually. It will absolutely hamper, hinder them, and I think slow down their efforts to do a real job in our space program.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that the House should say that they do not expect this language to be passed. Frankly, under section 307 of the law that was passed by the Congress there is an authorization for appropriation. They cannot get any appropriation in any way except by coming to the Congress and asking for it. If the law under which they are operating were a blanket authority to dig into the Treasury, that would be another story. But it is not that. It is a limited authority. It authorizes appropriations to be made, and those appropriations should not be made without very careful consideration by the committees of the Congress that have to consider them.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Supplementing what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] said, I know of no agency that has been put through any such wringer as this, that is required to get an authorization and then an appropriation on the ordinary run-of-the-mill items for that agency; am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. That is right; there is no question about it.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has indicated that the Congress should have control over this, and we agree to that.

Mr. TABER. But we do have control over it.

Mr. KEATING. We do, through the Committee on Appropriations. What we are objecting to is that this hamstringing operation requires their going before two committees.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made very clear that the word "hereafter" in the amendment is the key point. If the "hereafter" were removed, the language would not be necessary at all, because we have the authorization in the original bill.

Mr. TABER. The language would not be necessary anyway, because we already have limiting language in the authorization act.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this language were being considered originally in the House,

it would go out on a point of order, would it not?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Everybody agrees with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that the Congress wants to keep full control of the expenditure of money. He rightly says that for every clerk that is hired, the agency in question has to come back to us for appropriations. That will be true of this new agency if this language is stricken out; the only difference is that they—just like other agencies—will not have to come back each year for a reauthorization. If this Senate language is stricken out, the Congress still will have control of the expenditures of the agency. Is not that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will refuse to concur in this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 36 to H. R. 13450 would defeat the purposes of the National Aeronautics and Space Act enacted into law less than a month ago. That act was carefully drawn after extensive hearings and after meticulous consideration was given to all its provisions, including those related to appropriations. The membership of the Select Committee on Astronautics was unanimous in supporting the act as drawn, and both Houses passed the act without dissent. I cannot imagine that the Members really wish to reverse a decision so carefully considered and which brought such credit to the Congress. I cannot imagine that the Congress which has shown real understanding in pressing for a strong national space program would accept a hobbling and crippling machinery of control which will impede the new administration in its efforts to demonstrate world leadership in the development of the space sciences.

There can be no thought, upon reflection, that the Congress would surrender any real part of its responsibilities to the executive branch through failure to adopt this rider. The power over appropriations is unimpaired.

This amendment would require the busy officials of the new space administration each year to justify to four different committees every penny they need to spend. This is close to an impossible burden if they are also to have time to develop and to operate a comprehensive program in space technology and related matters. I would not want to burden them this way, and I think the events on this floor this afternoon make clear that my colleagues of the select committee who have given so much attention to this matter of organization and management share this view.

For any Member who does not recall the language of the Space Act as passed, provision is already made that authorizations are required for each specific construction and equipment budget item of \$250,000 or more. Rejection of this Senate amendment to this appropriation bill will not alter these requirements in the least. The general

authorization covering other expenditures provided by the Space Act is in keeping with normal practices for other Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has made a splendid, bipartisan start toward the formulation of a comprehensive and effective program for the exploration and development of space. We should not in any way sabotage that program by means of restricting riders and amendments such as this one. I feel certain the overwhelming majority of this body do not want to constrict our outer space efforts and will decisively defeat this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. FORD. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 126, nays 236, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]
YEAS—126

Abbutt	Fascell	Murray
Abernethy	Feighan	Nix
Albert	Fisher	Norrell
Alexander	Flood	Passman
Anderson,	Flynt	Patman
Mont.	Fogarty	Perkins
Andrews	Forand	Philbin
Anfuso	Forrester	Poage
Ashley	Fountain	Rabaut
Ashmore	Frazier	Riley
Ayres	Garmatz	Rivers
Bailey	Gary	Robeson, Va.
Barden	Gathings	Rogers, Colo.
Barrett	Grant	Rogers, Fla.
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Rogers, Tex.
Beckworth	Harris	Rooney
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Va.	Rutherford
Blitch	Healey	Santangelo
Boggs	Hemphill	Saund
Bonner	Herlong	Schenck
Breeding	Huddleston	Scott, N. C.
Brooks, Tex.	Hull	Selden
Brown, Ga.	Ikard	Shelley
Brown, Mo.	Jennings	Sheppard
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Byrne, Pa.	Kee	Smith, Miss.
Cannon	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Celler	Kilday	Staggers
Christopher	Kilgore	Steed
Coad	King	Teller
Cooley	Kirwan	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Kitchin	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Thornberry
Dent	Lankford	Tuck
Denton	Lennon	Vinson
Dingell	Lesinski	Walter
Dorn, S. C.	Loser	Whitener
Dowdy	Madden	Whitten
Eberhart	Magnuson	Williams, Miss.
Elliott	Mahon	Willis
Everett	Matthews	Wright
Evins	Mills	
Fallon	Mitchell	

NAYS—236

Adair	Bolton	Collier
Addonizio	Bosch	Corbett
Alger	Bow	Cramer
Allen, Calif.	Boyle	Cretella
Allen, Ill.	Bray	Cunningham,
Andersen,	Broomfield	Iowa
H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham,
Arends	Broynhill	Nebr.
Aspinall	Budge	Curtin
Auchincloss	Bush	Curtis, Mass.
Avery	Byrd	Curtis, Mo.
Baldwin	Byrne, Ill.	Dague
Baring	Byrnes, Wis.	Dawson, Ill.
Bass, N. H.	Canfield	Dawson, Utah
Bates	Carnahan	Delaney
Becker	Carrigg	Dellay
Belcher	Cederberg	Dennison
Bennett, Mich.	Chamberlain	Devereux
Berry	Chelf	Dixon
Betts	Chenoweth	Dollinger
Blatnik	Chipperfield	Donohue
Boland	Church	Dooley
Bolling	Clark	Dorn, N. Y.

Durham	Kruger	Reed
Dwyer	Lafore	Rees, Kans.
Edmondson	Laird	Reuss
Farbstein	Lane	Rhodes, Ariz.
Fenton	Latham	Rhodes, Pa.
Fino	Libonati	Riehlman
Ford	Lipscomb	Roberts
Fulton	McDonough	Robison, N. Y.
Gavin	McFall	Robison, Ky.
George	McGovern	Rodino
Glenn	McGregor	Rogers, Mass.
Granahan	McIntosh	Roosevelt
Gray	Macdonald	Sadlak
Green, Oreg.	Machrowicz	St. George
Griffin	Mack, Ill.	Saylor
Griffiths	Mack, Wash.	Scherer
Gross	Mailliard	Schwengel
Gubser	Marshall	Scrivner
Gwinn	Martin	Scudder
Hagen	May	Seely-Brown
Haley	Meador	Siler
Halleck	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Harden	Metcalf	Simpson, Pa.
Harvey	Michel	Sisk
Haskell	Miller, Md.	Smith, Calif.
Hays, Ark.	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Kans.
Hays, Ohio	Montoya	Springer
Henderson	Moore	Stauffer
Heseltun	Morano	Sullivan
Hess	Morgan	Taber
Hiestand	Moss	Talle
Hill	Moulder	Teague, Calif.
Hoeven	Multer	Tewes
Hollifield	Mumma	Thompson, N. J.
Holland	Natcher	Thomson, Wyo.
Holmes	Neal	Tollefson
Holt	Nicholson	Trimble
Holtzman	Nimtz	Udall
Horan	Norblad	Ullman
Hosmer	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Pelt
Hyde	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Jackson	O'Hara, Ill.	Vorys
Jarman	O'Konski	Vursell
Jensen	O'Neill	Watts
Johansen	Osmer	Weaver
Johnson	Ostertag	Westland
Jonas	Patterson	Wharton
Judd	Pelly	Widnall
Karsten	Post	Wigglesworth
Kean	Pillion	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Poff	Withrow
Keating	Polk	Wolverton
Kelly, N. Y.	Porter	Yates
Kluczyński	Price	Younger
Knox	Quile	Zablocki
Knutson	Ray	Zelenko
	Reece, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—67

Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Baumhart	Hébert	Preston
Beamer	Hillings	Prouty
Bentley	Hoffman	Radvan
Boykin	James	Rains
Brooks, La.	Jenkins	Scott, Pa.
Brownson	Jones, Mo.	Sheehan
Buckley	Kearney	Shuford
Burdick	Kilburn	Sieminski
Clevenger	LeCompte	Spence
Coffin	McCarthy	Taylor
Colmer	McCormack	Teague, Tex.
Coudert	McCulloch	Thompson, La.
Derounian	McIntire	Utt
Dies	McMillan	Vanik
Diggs	Mason	Wainwright
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Frelinghuysen	Minshall	Wilson, Calif.
Friedel	Morris	Winstead
Gordon	Morrison	Young
Hale	O'Hara, Minn.	
Hardy	Pilcher	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Beamer against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bentley against.
Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Wainwright against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Derounian against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Minshall against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Baker against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Young for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Weir for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Coffin with Mr. James.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Spence with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Shuford with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. HEMPHILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the word "hereafter" from said amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the effect of that amendment is to remove the requirement that each and every year from now on the Space Agency would have to come up here in the first instance and get an authorization bill before they could get an appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. That is the intent.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the basic Space Act takes care of the matter in that it requires them to come up and get the authorization for any construction over \$250,000 or for the acquisition of land, but the basic space legislation also says that appropriations are authorized, which gives to the Committee on Appropriations each year the right to look at and to approve or disapprove the budget submitted by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CANNON. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. FORD. The effect of the amendment is that they do not have to go through the tortuous process of an annual authorization bill as the legislation previously required.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the motion to recede and concur with an amendment, now that we are striking the word "hereafter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 24, line 11, insert:

**"OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION
"Salaries and expenses**

"For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its Territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals; and attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$4,700,000, of which \$37,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses,' Office of the Solicitor, fiscal year 1959: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3817, 85th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$4,700,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$4,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 27, line 8, insert:

"Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)

"For an additional amount for 'construction (liquidation of contract authorization)', \$10,000,000 to remain available until expended."

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$8,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 30, line 1, insert:

"OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-470), \$100,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 58, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$50,000."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next two amendments, Nos. 112 and 113, be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 112: Page 44, line 21, insert:

"UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY"

Senate amendment No. 113: Page 44, line 22, insert:

"Acquisition and construction of radio facilities

"For an additional amount of 'Acquisition and construction of radio facilities' \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 112 and 113.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer this preferential motion on the item referring to the United States Information Agency which would permit that Agency to construct facilities in the United States for a broadcast behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, into Africa, and into the Middle East. I may say that the administration asked for \$22,500,000 for this purpose and for the construction of other facilities abroad. The other body in its wisdom reduced that amount to \$15 million, \$10 million of which would be used for the construction of the facilities here in the United States in what is known as Baker East.

The one now proposed to take the place of the old Baker East would take six 500-kilowatt transmitters and six 250-kilowatt transmitters, with a total capacity of 4,840 kilowatts.

It seems to me the history of what has happened in the past few months would convince this House that it is necessary for us to speed up our propaganda facilities throughout the world. We have seen one small nation of the world completely upset within the past few weeks by the use of propaganda from a foreign nation. The Egyptian radio had penetrated into Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been so sincere in my life as I am today on this question. I think the whole survival, perhaps, of our country rests upon what we do in some of these items. I have been one of the critics of the United States Information Agency and the Voice of America in the past. I criticize them today, because I do not believe they have been putting forth the kind of programs that should go behind the Iron Curtain and also to the friendly countries of the world, that we might be able to tell the truth about America and to sell America to the people abroad that we would like to have as our friends.

I criticize them today but, Mr. Speaker, if we criticize a general in a hot war, if we criticize a division in a hot war, we would not deny the ammunition or the facilities to carry on the war in order to win. It is most important that we win this cold war as much as any hot war we have ever fought. This is one of the great instruments we can use in the fighting of the cold war to get the word out.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks I have been sitting in my living room here in Washington every night listening to a short-wave receiver, and when I turn on that short-wave set I can go across the dial and at five different places on that dial I listen to the voice of Moscow. It comes in as strong here in Washington as WTOP or our other local stations. We hear it in English. I hear the propaganda that they are putting out against us. On that same radio I listen to Prague from Czechoslovakia and Sofia and Warsaw—all coming into my living room here in Washington. We are not in a position today to penetrate not only to our friendly countries but behind the Iron Curtain to tell the story that should be told. I hope these facilities are granted to the Voice of America and that they will set up a program so that we can reach the peoples of the world with the real story of America; so that we can have these people as our friends and so that we can let the people behind the Iron Curtain know the truth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, before the distinguished gentleman proceeds further on this additional time; will the gentleman please explain to the House why these radio facilities are not available for use today?

Mr. BOW. Yes, I will be very happy to. The gentleman refers, I assume, to the original Baker East which was provided some years ago. The Committee on Appropriations of the House granted the right to buy the land and establish the facilities on the east coast. After this was provided by the House, a decision was made by the agency, or at that time by the State Department, not to go forward. I will say to the gentleman from New York very frankly it became somewhat of a political football and some political capital was made of it. I admit that to the gentleman and it is unfortunate that it happened. But, those facilities were to be built.

Mr. ROONEY. If the distinguished gentleman will further yield; when I asked my question, I must say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, as to why we do not have these radio facilities today, I thought he would explain to the House that the administration has never requested these facilities over the past 5½ years but on the contrary has insisted that the Voice of America was the best in the world.

Mr. BOW. Well, again, I agree with the gentleman. You know the gentleman from New York is going to come into the well of the House and he is going to make a splendid speech and he

is going to take this agency apart, as I think they should be taken apart in many instances, and he is going to be able to cite the record to you of their failures, and with much of that I am going to agree. But, I say to my colleagues in the House that that is past history. We are now faced with a situation: Are we going to surrender because of that? Or are we going to have the facilities to go forward? Are we going to change it so that we can get the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain? The point is that they do not have the facilities now and it is going to take us some time to get them. This \$10 million is only for the construction of Baker East to give us this strong station to send the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain and to send it into Africa and Europe and the Middle East. We can no longer depend, my colleagues, on relay stations in other countries throughout the world. We have to be prepared to do it from here because we do not know how long our leases will survive in those countries and how long they will be available. For our own protection we have to have facilities and we have to have them here, and we have to have them in such strength that we can penetrate these areas.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. TABER. I wish the gentleman would call attention to the fact that at the present time we have no facilities that can get behind the Iron Curtain or really get to the folks in the other countries around the world.

Mr. BOW. That is quite right. And I will say this to you, that they have told us in the past that they were getting through. They told us they were getting through the jamming and getting in, and we have not been doing that and that is not true.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Were they trying to mislead the committee over all the years that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has been a member of it when they were telling us that they were satisfactorily getting into Moscow and getting through the Soviet jamming or were they being just downright dishonest?

Mr. BOW. I do not know what the reason was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield; they did not fool the committee.

Mr. BOW. No, I think that is quite right. They were not fooling us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] was not fooled at all. When he was in Ankara and tried to get the Voice of America he could not get it. They said he just did not know how to tune the set in, but the truth of the matter was it was not coming through.

Mr. ROONEY. I must in all candor respectfully disagree with my friend and make the confession that they have fooled me at least for the last 5 or 6 years. For 13 years we have appropriated every nickel asked for the Voice of America, every nickel, never once did

I vote to cut them, not 1 year in the 13 years. They were always allowed the full amount for broadcasting operations.

As far as radio facilities are concerned, they have not asked us for money for these facilities in the past 5 years, and now you say we cannot get into Moscow.

Mr. BOW. I say we are not getting into Moscow. They are jamming us. We do not have the strength to get through. We have had faulty ammunition. We have tried to correct the ammunition, but we have got to have the materiel to fire the good ammunition when we have it. I am admitting some of the things the gentleman said are true. We sat side by side. We have criticized this agency.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield the gentleman from Ohio an additional minute, Mr. Speaker, in order that I may ask him a question.

Does the gentleman not think that the House and the House Committee on Appropriations should have an opportunity to hold thorough hearings on a \$27 million request such as Baker East as well as on a program that will run into \$50 million or \$60 million? Or should this agency and the administration be permitted to come in during the last few days of a Congress and circumvent the House and its Appropriations Committee by going to the Senate for a brief perfunctory hearing on a huge appropriation such as this?

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman that the amendment has been reduced from \$25 million to \$10 million. This amount was allowed in order to get a start on this most important program.

Let me say in conclusion that this is a matter in which the President is quite concerned. The President is for this and wants to start this \$10 million installation in the United States, and I am sure that the leadership knows that this is one of the items in this whole program about which the President is most concerned.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the sorriest situations which we have ever faced; and it was not unforeseen. I just do not know why this USIA agency has never quite been able to get done what the Congress authorized it to do, and urged it to do, and has taken it to task almost every year for not doing. Yet, somehow or other, the money has been spent and the results have not come up to what this country had a right to expect.

Many of you will remember that in 1947 when we were considering just what to do in this whole information field, a joint committee of the House and Senate, of which the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and our then colleague, Congressman KARL MUNDT, were co-chairmen, visited 22 countries in Europe, on both sides of the Curtain, to study our information program including the Voice of America. I remember very well one night in Bucharest, Rumania, when

we listened to the Communist message coming over the radio, clear as a bell from half a dozen different capitals, but when we tried to get the Voice of America all we could get was squeaks and squawks and static. Everywhere in Europe it was the same; ours was a very poor and weak signal.

Back here, we insisted in our reports somehow or other this country must get transmitting facilities second to none. It is intolerable that the United States with all its technological accomplishments cannot make itself heard around the world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota will tell the House why it is that this agency over all the years and with all the millions of taxpayers' dollars it has spent did not have the courage to come to the House of Representatives and ask for the money to create the new radio facilities.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know. It is not because we have not protested. As I said in the beginning, it is a sorry situation and I do not see how it can be justified. But our job now is to get out of the bad situation and get ahead.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I talked to a distinguished American just back from a visit to Central America. He said that one night in Nicaragua, when the Lebanon crisis was at its height, they turned on the radio and could get 11 stations broadcasting the Communist story in Spanish, in Portuguese, and in English. But they could get only one station telling the American story and its signal was very poor.

Look what we have in the Middle East. Egypt, has a practically bankrupt government; we are the richest country in the world. Egypt is supposed to be backward in technology; we boast about being the best in the world, we are so boastful of our technological achievements. Yet Egypt has a 300-kilowatt station in Cairo broadcasting around the clock to all those parts of the world. The United States has not a single broadcasting or relay station above 100 kilowatts. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it is intolerable for the United States to be itself so far behind Egypt or any other country in the world in this all-important war of words and ideas.

We have relay stations abroad designed to boost our signal, but who can be sure that those relay stations may not be denied to us, or ever be taken away from us.

Mr. ROONEY. When did the gentleman find all this out? Why did this administration not ask for funds for adequate radio facilities?

Mr. JUDD. I have been protesting the inadequacy of our broadcasting facilities, as the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will testify, every single year when this operation came up. I can go back into the record of the committee and the record of debates in the House and show where we have urged action to make sure we do a better job in getting

the truth through. We were always told that our story was being heard; but whenever we could get independent statements from personal friends over there, they would tell us that the American signal is not anywhere near as good as is the Russian signal or the signals of its satellites or the British signal.

But it does not help much today to go over the past, I will accept my share of the blame. The task now is to get going. We cannot allow ourselves to be dependent on weak stations anywhere; and we cannot be dependent on relay stations in other countries, some of which may be taken over at any time by the countries where they are. We have to have the best stations in the world here in the United States so that we can make our story heard around the world on our own power, just as the Russians are able to do. The United States has no business being third, fourth, or fifth in this field. We must be first, just as we are in every enterprise to which we dedicate ourselves in earnest.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Have we ever found out why these conditions have existed all these years? It sounds to me like somebody has infiltrated in these agencies someplace.

Mr. JUDD. At one time half a dozen years ago, when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and I were discussing this same matter during debate, I said that at the end of the war this agency was the most infiltrated agency in our Government. When we were fighting with Russia against Hitler and Japan, a large number of Communists and pro-Communists were knowingly brought into the Office of War Information, because they are the best propagandists in the world and the most skillful in demoralizing or confusing their enemies which at that time were ours, too. After the war they blanketed the OWI personnel without any real check into the new information agency. Naturally they then propagandized subtly against ourselves, because with Hitler gone, we were the new enemy to be confused and defeated. Those in the agency swore that the situation had been cleaned up, that all of that questionable personnel had been cleaned out. Of course, these holdovers, and their unknown colleagues whom they always seem to manage to get in with them, were too smart ever to make pro-Communist statements. What they did was just to unsell the United States. They just did not do a good job of telling our story—it is weak, half-hearted, unconvincing. If they had made a single pro-Communist statement they would have been detected and eliminated.

It is hard to believe so second rate a job could have been done in this field, unless someone planned it that way. Why should the United States be limping and lagging when we could have the best facilities in the world? We have the best story to tell and yet we often do not make as good or as strong an impression abroad with our inferior facilities as

other countries make with an inferior story but superior facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be adopted.

Mr. SCHERER. From what the gentleman has said and from what I have heard on the floor today, does the gentleman not think we ought to have a complete Congressional investigation as to why these conditions have existed over this long period of time? I think every Member of this House would want to know that.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. If a judge did what these fellows are doing, they would be impeached; if we did what they are doing, we would be defeated or unseated. Why in the name of heaven do we not fire these people? With all of the money that we have appropriated over the years, I am amazed, I am shocked, I am astonished, I am knocked off of my perch as a result of this information to the effect that after 13 years of my voting for this program, we have not yet penetrated the Iron Curtain. Why? What's wrong? Obviously there is something bad, really off-stroke in this agency. An investigation ought to be in order, and soon. The taxpayers are entitled to a better deal.

Mr. JUDD. I am afraid that off our perch is where we are all likely to be unless we today take action to get going.

Mr. CHELF. Can we not get rid of these fellows in some way or other? It seems that 13 years of trying is far too long. We need action in order to get the story of democracy and of America over to the world. We cannot lose this cold war.

Mr. JUDD. It has been the same sad story under both administrations; neither can point the finger at the other. But let us point the finger at ourselves right now and start to get the thing corrected.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman presents a most serious problem. I would like to inquire along what line of reasoning could we conclude that the money as authorized here would be spent more carefully, more profitably and properly than the money that has been wasted in the past? I would be willing to vote for this or any amount more if it can be shown that the money will be spent more wisely than it has been spent in the past.

Mr. JUDD. It is my understanding that this is the first time we have actually appropriated funds for the construction of this big broadcasting station down in North Carolina to send across the Atlantic. At one time we had discussion about it, and I think authorization of funds. Also for a station in Oregon—to send across the Pacific.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota will kindly yield, I did not clearly hear

him, what did the gentleman say about this being the first time? For what?

Mr. JUDD. The first time, so far as I recall, that we have appropriated funds specifically for the purpose for which this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would authorize \$10 million, that is, to start construction of the big facility in North Carolina.

Mr. ROONEY. Nonsense; land in North Carolina was appropriated for, and actually acquired in January 1952. But this administration sold those 2,817 acres of land in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C., in July and August 1956. Besides, \$2,533,000 for transmitters was expended at that time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say to the gentleman that money was appropriated, land was purchased and the money appropriated for the facility. Unfortunately they did not go ahead. And, one of the black marks against this whole program is that they sold it down there, after we gave them the money and they purchased the land, at a loss of \$1.5 million. That is one of the situations we are faced with today. We have to go ahead now and do the job, and the Congress should make sure that it is done, and I am sure the President of the United States will see that this money is used for this purpose and to build a facility that will be properly used.

Mr. JUDD. It is my recollection that there were charges in the other body that the particular locations chosen in North Carolina and Oregon were not well suited from an atmospheric standpoint for sending a strong signal. In fact, I believe the charge was made that certain persons in the agency had deliberately chosen the poorest locations in the United States in order to keep the signal weak and ineffective, no matter how much we spent on the stations. So the land was given up. But who then bought the land on the west coast? Private broadcasting interests promptly bought the land. They apparently considered it the best place out there to put broadcasting facilities.

Mr. CHELF. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio. There ought to be an investigation made of this outfit, and before the sun sets tonight.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious and bad. All right. Are we going to spend our time looking backward, or are we going to have the courage—and sometimes it is spelled with four letters, a stronger word—to really face up to where we are and do the kind of thing that will do something for our country? If this facility is erected in this country, we certainly can handle it better and have better oversight than if it were built somewhere else. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in the studies I have made of Moscow and communism, the methods, their strategy and their tactics all over the world for the last 40 years, that I know something about it. And I

know that unless we do take some stand, regardless of what has gone before, America will be in a bad way. We should look ahead and say to ourselves "This is the time when we must do it, or we perish." If you do not have a shortwave set, get one, a small transistor set will do it—get one and listen in on Moscow's wavelengths; 5, 6, or 7 of them come in every night. Listen in and see how you would like to be flooded with that sort of thing day in and day out. Because Moscow and her satellites do have the necessary facilities; they can and do flood the world day and night. That is what is going on in the Near East; it is going on in Africa and Africa, Mr. Speaker, probably holds the future of mankind in her hands. It seems to me we would be penny wise and pound foolish not to start building an adequate facility. Granted, we here in this House have a responsibility to see to it that it does a good job. But, Mr. Speaker, we had better get busy and do the job.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in answer to some of the people who have been wanting an investigation of this agency that the agency comes under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman. We have had them up before us on occasion. The reason we have not gone further than we have is that they have a new director in the office. We helped get rid of Mr. Larson, who was running a political agency, and the President has appointed a new director. We thought we ought to give him time to get his feet on the ground and to see what really was going on in his own agency. I have every confidence that Mr. Allen will do a good job. Very shortly he will be called in to give an accounting.

As far as going back over the 10 years, as to why they have not been able to penetrate, I hope to go into that; but I shall be frank and say that this debate today has brought out some material that was new to me. Very shortly, after the adjournment of Congress, we are going to have the new director in and we shall go into that explicitly and thoroughly.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman consider the question of a review of the civil-service laws that have brought these incompetents and subversives into the Government, so that an agency would not have to spend 5 years to get rid of an incompetent or a subversive? The type of protection the civil service affords is a protection not of the Nation, not of the public, but merely of the employee, and at all times.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If anything like that is brought out, I shall be glad to refer it to the Committee on the Civil Service, with the recommendation that they do something about it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be perfectly frank with you. I have known that this outfit was no good for a long time, ever since it started. I have suggested various things to different people who have been in charge of it, that might have put it on its feet and make it an effective agency of the United States Government. Frankly, there is not any question that it has been utterly worthless and helpless.

It was about 2 months ago, if I remember correctly—I may be a little bit too conservative on that—but about 2 months ago a new man was put in charge of it, George Allen, a member of the Foreign Service of the United States, who comes from South Carolina. Everybody in that part of the country, practically speaking, is a Democrat, and I assume that he is a Democrat. So that, with an appointment from a Republican President, there could hardly be expected a continuation of political activities in connection with that agency.

I have known George Allen for the last 10 or 12 years. He was in there for a little while, back in 1948, and he did several things to help loosen it up, get it started. But he was taken away pretty soon and again went back to the Foreign Service. He is the only one who has been in charge of the agency who has shown signs of life.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to see today is this motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], adopted. I want to see that we get on the job and do something. That is what we need to do. That is what the President needs to have, support along the line of our foreign policy, so that it can be good for something, so that we can get somewhere. We cannot get anywhere by postponing action. We have got to start to do something. This is one of the most crucial things that we have in front of us. Let us go ahead and do business and not postpone matters until the last of next year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from New York and also to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that I am so pleased that they take the position they take today. It is easy to look back and find mistakes, but, as a former colleague of ours used to say, there is no pancake so flat that it does not have two sides. Mistakes have two sides, too. It is human to err. We have erred. But as Americans in this House today what we are talking about is something that is in the best interests of this country of ours. We should immediately adopt the proposal as put forth in the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. TABER. I have known this thing was not right, and I have been putting it up to these people day after day and hour after hour, trying to get them to move and to do something. Now we have the start of a motion. Let us get behind it and push it and put it across.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I want to see this problem solved. If he is convinced that misfits have made a mess of it in the past, I want the gentleman to tell me. I know he would not support the legislation unless he fully believed that the intention from now on is to have it administered at the level where this money will be spent in such a way that the problem will be solved and will be solved properly.

Mr. TABER. That is just what I want to see done, and that is just why I propose to apply every bit of pressure I can to see that they go ahead and do something and make it something.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows I attend the meetings at the White House. I should like to say to the Members that the President of the United States has always taken a very great and active interest in this whole program. Particularly is he impressed with its absolute necessity at this time. I do not know of anything we have discussed down there about which he has been more concerned than this. I just propose that this matter can be taken care of.

Mr. TABER. This is the situation: We have 2 or 3 of these 100,000-watt setups in New York City and around that territory. Out of that spot there is so much interference in the air that it is almost impossible to get anything across. We do not have adequate facilities, so that if the material we are putting on the air was any good it could be delivered. If we go ahead with this million-watt setup we can have facilities that will be strong enough and powerful enough to drive through the interference. Let us do it. Let us all get behind this man Allen and push him to do the things he ought to do to make this thing more and more effective and take care of our interests in the world.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Does the gentleman feel that if Mr. George Allen is given sufficient time he will straighten out this mess?

Mr. TABER. I hope he will. I am going to do everything I can. Frankly, I frequently talk to him on the subject and for long stretches. I am going to do everything I can, and I am going to furnish him with every bit of information I have available, as I have in the past, so that he will have a chance to go ahead and do the job; and I believe he will be given the chance to do it.

Mr. CHELF. Is it true he has been there only a couple of months?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CHELF. Then I feel very different about the situation. I thought probably he was operating under the same bunch of screwballs for the past 13 years. But if a man has been there

only 60 days, I agree with the gentleman he ought to be given an opportunity. Then if he does not perform, let us get somebody who can.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND].

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I do not come to the well of the House to hold a brief for what has been done by the Voice of America in the past or even what has been done by the Secretary of State in the past 5 or 6 years, or what he is doing today. I come here to tell you my own experiences and my own intense feelings.

I took a trip around the world on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs last year, and I have come back with this conclusion: Notwithstanding hundreds of millions and billions of dollars which we are giving in foreign aid, mostly in military assistance, we have not made much success in what I call the public-relations job. In country after country the leaders of countries in the Far East confided in me. I was asked this question everywhere by sincere and honest so-called friends of the United States. My colleagues: Just listen to this question. This is the question that was asked me over and over again: "Why are the Americans afraid of the Communists?" I do not blame anybody else. I was brought up so that when things go wrong with me, I blame no one but myself. My friends, I say we have failed to do a good enough public-relations job. We are engaged in a cold war today and we know it. I will call that cold war a one-game series. My friends, we have to win that game. We must come out first best because there is no such thing as second best because there will be no other game in the series. Our job is to win the hearts and minds of the people the world over. We are suffering defeats in the United Nations and we are suffering defeats everywhere because we have neglected this public-relations job. I went into a country where last year we gave \$250 million in foreign aid. The total population of that country is 12 million. When I traveled in that country or when any other American traveled anywhere inside that country, he not only had to have a chauffeur but he had to have an armed guard. We were giving \$250 million to a people where the life of an American was not safe. I say before we give \$250 million in foreign aid, if it takes \$20 million to tell the people of that country what America stands for, then let us spend that \$20 million first before the \$250 million foreign aid is given. The Voice of America has made mistakes. If somebody says it will cost \$10 million to tell America's story behind the Iron Curtain or to tell America's story to the neutral countries, my friends, let us spend that \$10 million. We cannot afford to take a chance. I say again Americans are a nation of super salesmen. Americans have remained comfortably unconcerned as to what the rest of the world thinks about them. We cannot remain unconcerned any longer. Let us give the Voice of America \$10 million or even \$50 million if there is

any chance of doing some public-relations job.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I know George Allen who heads the United States Information Agency and know him very well. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for 12 years I have watched George Allen on his various responsible Government assignments, and I want you Representatives here to know he is from North Carolina and not South Carolina and, secondly, he is as fine a southern gentleman as I have ever met.

In our United States Foreign Service officer group, he is as competent a Foreign Service officer as we have in the United States service. George Allen is thoroughly experienced in the Mid-East. As Mr. TABER has said, the time has been short that he has had responsibility for this Agency. George Allen has been there a little less than a year. He should certainly have the time to reorganize this difficult Agency and do the job that we, in the Congress, expect of him.

This situation where there are so many cries for sudden punishment is like the new boy in school: If you are taking somebody to the woodshed, be sure you take the right boy to the woodshed. You have got the wrong one when you take George Allen.

May I say this to you: I was abroad last year, and one of our duties on the European Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee was to see how the Voice of America was operating, and, likewise, Radio Free Europe, which is not Government-operated. I found they were both well-run and managed. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, certain Members in Congress sometimes get too excited about programs that the United States is doing abroad because we are not patient enough. We in the United States are doing all right abroad; we are not losing friends, we have more friends than many of you would know. We have good basic friends.

But when the United States tries to give what is the truth on the radio and say what our promises will be, it takes time to show that often other's statements are lies, and that they do not live up to their promises. So, of course, these poor people around the world are taken in by grand promises and little performance.

The proof of the pudding, Mr. Speaker, is that these people in foreign countries are still voting overwhelmingly in the United Nations for the general policies of the United States of America and the policy of the Free World, for peace and development. Surely, we fall behind occasionally, but we are so often ahead, it is a good spur to us to have to do our best in hard competition.

So, I say let us get this particular United States radio installation recommended by the amendment of FRANK BOW, and we should pass the amendment, likewise, to give a vote of confidence in the Voice of America and the new leadership of the United States information program under that fine fellow, George Allen.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, since the name of George Allen has entered this debate here this afternoon I have asked for this brief time.

Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for this Agency. I think the House is pretty well aware of the failure of it. But I was delighted, when I was abroad last year, to spend some time with George Allen, and when he was asked to take this position I felt a great relief. I have known George Allen for many years. If any man in America can do anything for this Agency I have confidence that George Allen can do it.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Is the gentleman in a position to say that George Allen has ever complained to him about his inability to get rid of certain incompetent personnel in the USIA?

Mr. DURHAM. I have no doubt of his ability to get rid of them.

Mr. SCHERER. Has he ever complained to you that because of the law he has been unable to get rid of them, that he is handicapped?

Mr. DURHAM. No; he has not.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may require.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, if this House were to adopt the pending motion of the gentleman from Ohio to spend the amount of \$10 million at this time on this project it would mean a total expenditure of at least \$27 million of the taxpayers' money for this Baker East transmitter. We are going to see who are the advocates of economy in government and sensible spending, and who are not.

The House or its Appropriations Committee has never been given an opportunity to inquire into this present situation. The House, and I will take the period of the past 5 years, or the other body, the entire Congress of the United States, has not turned down in that period of time any request for radio facilities for the Voice of America; and in all the past years has allowed every nickel requested for radio broadcasting, although savings were made each year in the rest of the USIA program on all sorts of silly things uncovered by the House Appropriations Committee here and brought to the attention of the House. But here we are confronted with a situation where in order to deliberately get around the House Committee on Appropriations and to avoid their searching examination, they sent up to the other body a budget estimate of \$22.3 million after this supplemental appropriation bill passed the House and went to the other body.

If there is the slightest merit to this request for \$22,300,000 that amount should be appropriated and not the \$10 million provided for in the pending motion, because this is the sort of compromise that invariably costs the taxpayers more money in the long run.

Perhaps I can convince this House that if it goes along with the House

Committee on Appropriations in this instance and gives the House Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to investigate this serious matter during the Congressional recess, and permits the committee to hold hearings during the recess between now and January, we will come up with the proper answer.

I submit that the procedure being followed in this matter by the present free-spending administration and USIA ignores the House. As I said, they went to the other body after this bill left the House, asked for \$22.3 million, whereupon the other body allowed them to settle for \$15 million. Now the administration and USIA want \$10 million. This is no way to play around with the taxpayers' money.

What happened with regard to this in the other body? The printed hearings which I have here run, as far as the Senators' questions and USIA answers are concerned, from page 491 to page 500, 9½ pages, on a request for taxpayers' funds that would eventually run up to \$50 million or \$60 million. Why, these hearings do not even show in what State they would locate this Baker East or east coast transmitter. I had to have inquiry made of USIA.

Where are they going to locate it? They propose to locate it in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C. Lo, and behold, in 1951 the Congress appropriated money to build a high-power transmitter in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C. We find that after Congress appropriated

the money, and as recently as August of 1956—up to August 2, 1956—2 years ago, the administration sold the property at a loss to the taxpayers of at least \$1,217,000, an admitted loss on their part, mind you. I am reading from their own figures. They bought the property there in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C., for \$82 an acre. They bought 2,817 acres for \$233,000. They then spent \$112,000 of your money on engineering designs; land improvements, \$25,000; construction fee, \$115,000; construction and installation, including construction of roads, buildings, drainage, sewerage, water supply, and so forth, \$809,000. Oh yes; other costs of \$89,000.

The following information was furnished the committee by USIA:

U. S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Acquisition and construction of radio facilities—Financial statement of Baker East (canceled March 1953)

[In thousands]

Item and description	Actual obligations, June 30, 1958	Non-recoverable obligations to the appropriation	Non-recoverable obligations to U. S. Government	Remarks
Transmitters:				
4 dual 500-kilowatt shortwave.....	\$2,081			The 4 dual 500-kilowatt transmitters are planned for Projects Sahara and Gamma. The 2 100-kilowatt transmitters have been installed at Projects Jade and John.
2 100-kilowatt shortwave.....	452			
Subtotal.....	2,533			
Engineering design.....	112	\$112	\$112	
Site acquisition and improvement:				
Land (2,817.69 acres).....	233	233	73	The land was sold by GSA (July 10-Aug. 2, 1956) for \$125,000. Timber rights were sold for \$35,000. The total receipts \$160,000 were deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.
Land improvement.....	25	25	25	
Subtotal.....	258	258	98	
Construction and installation:				
Construction fee.....	115	115	115	This covers construction of roads, buildings, drainage, sewage, water supply, etc. The facility was in various stages of completion at the time the project was canceled.
Construction and installation.....	809	809	809	
Subtotal.....	924	924	924	
Other costs.....	89	83	83	This covers various miscellaneous supplies, antennas, shipping, audio equipment, etc. The audio equipment, valued at \$6,000, will be used by the Agency.
Total.....	3,916	1,377	1,217	

Now, after having as recently as within the past 2 years sold this property for \$125,000 or about \$44 an acre, and remember they bought it for \$82 an acre, and they also bought radio equipment at a cost of over \$2½ million which became secondhand the day they took possession of it—this administration permitted a loss of \$1,217,000 plus 50 percent of the cost of the radio equipment. What does this administration and USIA now want to do? They want this \$10 million to acquire a site in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C., for the Baker East transmitter. They want to buy land, including swampland there, at \$200 an acre. There is \$1,100,000 included in Mr. Bow's \$10 million for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, for years this administration and USIA have been kidding us. They insisted their broadcasts got into Moscow, that they got by the Russians and satellites. At no time did Dr. Johnson or Mr. Strubert or Mr. Larson tell us to the contrary.

In the fall of 1955 I went to the Island of Rhodes in the eastern Mediterranean to visit and see about the floating transmitter to the Middle East, the *Courier*,

which was tied up there along shore. My committee helped build that ship and relay transmitter on certain assurances. I found that it was ineffective, that it could not operate without being tied up next to the shore of the Island of Rhodes or without a big station which was constructed on top of a hill, at considerable additional cost to the taxpayers.

This was 3 years ago, in the fall of 1955. We recommended that they get rid of it. Oh, no. And what does the distinguished Mr. Allen have to say about it now?

Included in the 9½ pages of colloquy in the other body we find these questions and answers:

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I have a question at that point. What about the installations that we had aboard a ship in the Mediterranean?

Mr. ALLEN. We are using that ship, Senator THYE. It is at the Island of Rhodes at the present time, but it is not in any way adequate. It is a 50-kilowatt medium wave station and even at night it can only reach part way into the Middle East and the African Continent. In the daytime it can just barely be heard in along the seaboard, at Beirut and Alexandria.

These cities are not far from the Island of Rhodes.

Mr. ALLEN. It has turned out that the ship has been a disappointment, in all frankness. We can move it, but the ship serves as a relay base, so the ship itself has to receive the signal first and then boost it out. In order to receive it adequately, the ship has to be tied up alongside the shore and have its receiving antenna on the land. We have tried it at sea a little but it just does not work very well.

This is the ship *Courier* that you have heard me discuss previously on this floor, and concerning which I made protest. They have a Coast Guard crew of about 110 men living in beautiful, delightful homes on the shore of the Island of Rhodes. Do you think anybody paid any attention to the situation there? No.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] asked a question about people down in the Agency that Ambassador Allen cannot get rid of. The people he should get rid of he cannot get rid of because they have been appointed by the White House. If you vote for this motion what assurance do you have that the \$10 million will be spent any more wisely than the previous money?

Now, let us go a bit further on this question. Mr. Allen says that it would take 2 to 3 years to construct this transmitter in North Carolina to take the place of the transmitter that this administration and USIA abandoned, if you please. Is a delay of about 4 months going to hurt? Is it not proper that the Agency and its engineers and the people concerned come before the House Committee on Appropriations and make a case for \$27 million of taxpayers' money? If they make a case—and, as I said before, as one who has never voted to cut one nickel for the Voice of America, having been assured they were doing a good job—and I say we will give them a fair hearing—and if they are entitled to the money we will recommend it. We will hold hearings during the recess. What is unfair about that? What is not sensible about that?

Why is that not the right approach? Why not go along with this proposition, for if you accept the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], you are embarking on a project that is going to cost the taxpayers \$27 million, a project that was abandoned by the same people running this Agency only as recently as 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, in the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1958, and 1959, the Congress appropriated \$67,146,939 for acquisition and construction of USIA radio facilities. At the specific requests of this administration and USIA, in the 83d and 84th Congresses, we consented to the transfer of \$10,106,717 of these moneys which were appropriated to bolster broadcasting facilities, for use for other and different purposes. Not only did this administration use that \$10,106,717 for salaries and expenses of the Department of State and the United States Information Agency, but they did so at a time when they were inflexible in their testimony and position that the Voice of America was operating 100 percent efficiently and was piercing the Iron Curtain every day of the year even in the face of Soviet jamming which attempted to keep it out of Moscow, the Soviet Union, and the satellites.

Every time this committee made inquiry of Mr. Streibert and the other heads of the United States Information Agency since 1953, we were flatly informed that the VOA broadcasting operation was a perfect one. All you need do is go back over the reams and reams of press releases issued by Streibert, Larson, and company, widely carried in the press of America advising the public of the great accomplishments of this Agency, at least insofar as the Voice of America was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled when I first learned that these people running the United States Information Agency did not present a request such as this to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives either in connection with the regular annual supply bill for the Agency or in connection with the pending supplemental appropriations bill for 1959. I submit that their present procedure is nothing more than a gimmick to avoid a detailed, searching examination of the deceit which has

been perpetrated upon the Congress and the American taxpayers.

In the mere 9½ pages—pages 491 to 500—of testimony taken before the Appropriations Committee of the other body, to which I have previously referred, I was amazed to find, beginning on page 491, the following statement of Mr. Allen:

(b) Obsolescence and low power of existing domestic facilities make it virtually impossible to deliver reliable signals to our relay bases, to say nothing of direct coverage of European and Middle Eastern target areas in the face of jamming.

As a preliminary I repeat my reference to the fact that the Congress appropriated money back about 1951 for the construction of a high-powered transmitter on the east coast of the United States in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C., known then as Baker East. After necessary funds were appropriated by the Congress for this project and the project later discontinued by the administration on the ground that it was not feasible, how should one feel at this point in the current calendar year 1958 to read the following recent testimony of Mr. Allen before the other body:

The main item I would like to stress is a \$10 million appropriation to increase our facilities on the east coast of the United States. Now, we have discussed that item inside the executive branch of the Government, since 1951. Every year, either in the Agency or the State Department or in Bureau of the Budget, it has been said, "Well, let's go along as we are now and another time, next year maybe, we will come forward with it."

Mr. Allen further testified:

I would like to repeat what I said before you came in, that our file shows that we have been discussing the east coast facilities for years. However, each time it has come up, somebody has come along and said put it off until next year. Egypt started building a 600-kilowatt transmitter 2 years ago. They have 300 kilowatts installed already and everybody is talking about how Egypt can blanket the area. You have a hard time trying to find the Voice of America because we didn't start building transmitters sooner.

Another matter that drew my attention and is contained in the printed Senate hearings, is the following testimony of Mr. Allen, at page 496 of those hearings:

Americans in places like Baghdad, who had no communication with the outside world, are now learning to depend on the Voice of America for their news in English, and it is a very fine development.

Is it possible that we are spending the millions of dollars involved in this program in order to furnish a news service in English to Americans in Baghdad, if you please? I have always thought that the purpose of this Agency was to combat the propaganda of the Soviet Union.

Although I have served for many years in connection with the appropriations for the United States Information Agency and although I have always been for a good information program, I find myself continually confronted with the hocus-pocus of the Agency. During the course of the hearings in the early part of this year on the regular annual appropriations bill and the item therein for the United States Information Agency,

there was the following printed testimony beginning at page 243:

FILM SHOWINGS TO AMERICAN AUDIENCES

Mr. ALLEN. I wonder if I could take this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to find out the views of the committee on a question that has been put up to me several times. Several people have complained to me that there are excellent films in the USIA film catalog which Americans would like to see but we do not allow them to do so. I have assumed that it was entirely proper and perhaps even obligatory, when Americans want to see what we are doing with our appropriations, that we should allow them to do so, but I find some differences of views in my own staff as to whether we ought to do that or not.

Recently a committee was appointed by the President which met in the State Department, concerned with cultural matters overseas. In that committee meeting I was attacked rather severely for holding close to our chest films that would be very important, they felt, for American people to see. I told them we certainly could not hire a hall and put on a showing for American people, but if proper American institutions and organizations asked to borrow our films, I saw no reason why we could not lend them to them and let them show the films.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the American taxpayer's money for USIA was to be spent to show these films abroad in order to combat communism.

If you get into the area suggested you will need a lot of manpower when you give something away for free and it will cost the American taxpayer tremendous sums of money to show these films to American people. You would be building up to something like the \$800,000 of taxpayers' money to tell the American people they ought to go to the Brussels Fair. That is not why we are at the Brussels Fair at all. We are there to compete with other peoples of the world on the standing of the United States in cultural achievements and so forth. I think all your films should be working or in use overseas.

Those are my personal ideas.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your reply. I want to make it clear I take no attitude on the question. I am groping for advice, and thought this was the appropriate place to ask that question, but maybe not.

Mr. ROONEY. This committee and the Congress does not run the executive branch of Government and we never take the position of saying "You do thus and so." We do say, "Do not do thus and so" after you make the mistake. I do not think it is the function of this Appropriations Committee to say "You must use the money for thus and so" unless it is in line with your request.

We have followed this policy for years and shall, I hope, continue to do. When we find instances where the American taxpayers' money has been foolishly spent or squandered, we shall highlight it.

As to your films, we look at these films every year. We have never been very much impressed by them. And we will look at them again this year. We will spend as many days as necessary to look at the films. They are very expensive.

Mr. ALLEN. On the point of whether we have films in the United States, I do not know how many films we have, but I agree surely that the main place for these films is outside the United States. I can understand that we might have a copy right now of the Marian Anderson film, for example. I do not know.

Mr. SHELTON. Sir, we have library prints, usually one print of each film.

Mr. ALLEN. I should think, Mr. Chairman, that if the American public wants to see what we are doing and asks us to lend them copies of a film, we might be subject to

proper criticism if we say, "No, you cannot see what we are doing." As regards the radio scripts of the Voice of America, there is a specific provision in the law that says we must make those scripts available if anyone asks for them.

Mr. PRESTON. May I make a comment on that, which is my own personal view. There are two objections I can see to the releasing of those films to the American public on demand. The first is it would soon grow to a very large program, because it has become very popular in civic meetings when they cannot get a speaker, to show movies. Pretty soon you would have a terrific demand from clubs, PTA's, the League of Women Voters, and other organizations.

Secondly, the people who look at the film are not always aware of the objective sought in the film. If you make a film slanted toward an objective in a certain area of the world, a lot of them would not be familiar with the circumstances in that area and would not understand what you are trying to do in that area, and would not be competent to judge the film, then you would be having criticisms you would spend long hours trying to explain away. This is a highly specialized activity, and I do not think it would be a good idea.

Mr. ALLEN. I agree it takes good, sound judgment to decide what to do about films. I have specifically in mind a request which was made, I believe, by the American Council on Islamic Affairs, which was going to have a meeting and they would like to see the films made of the Sultan of Morocco during his visit here. Those are the type of requests I have to answer, and I am glad to have the chance to have it discussed.

Mr. PRESTON. I can understand how that would be a different request from one from the Kiwanis Club of Podunk, Iowa, who might want to show a particular film just because it was United Nations Week that week. It would run into a pretty big operation. I think there could be exceptions made here and there, but as a broad policy if you went into that you would soon be just a film library and it would require the services of a lot of people.

Mr. ALLEN. It may be that this can be handled through some other organization of the Government. I do not know the setup well enough to judge, but the Office of Education, for example, does have a lot of films, prints of which can be obtained by the public.

Mr. ROONEY. Those films are educational films for American use. I do not think there is an agency of Government that is not in the film business. The Armed Forces are; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is; everybody is in it. With regard to your Agency, I have been appropriating money for it for years in the belief that it was to combat communism abroad and that your activities were to be abroad and not in the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. I think I have the tenor of your views, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate them.

Mr. ROONEY. Ours is a democratic process. I am only one member of this committee. Those are my personal views and always have been. I am for the Agency and have been over the years. But I want to cut out the nonsense that always creeps into your program. It will cost the American taxpayer a lot of needless money if you distribute these films in the United States, and I would not vote 15 cents for the cost of showing those films here.

About 3 weeks ago, at 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, I found on my television set a motion picture which was stated to have been produced by the USIA and the BBC. This motion picture, which was stated to have been released through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare, was about as silly a film as one can imagine. It concerned a department store here in the District of Columbia, showed Negroes doing all the menial work, and if it did nothing else it did give publicity to the people who owned that store. This whole business seemed so silly to me at the moment, that the following day I requested the staff, in view of the testimony which I have brought to your attention, to find out what the situation was. Imagine my amazement when I was handed the following papers prepared by the United States Information Agency pursuant to my request:

MOTION PICTURES OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY RELEASED FOR PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL USE IN THE UNITED STATES¹ (AS OF AUGUST 13, 1958)

America Presents America.
American Newsboy.
An American Portrait.
The Ancient Curse.
And Now Miguel.
Appalachian Trail.
Apprentice Training.
Around This Table.
Arts of Japan.
Asian Artists in Crystal.
Atoms for Peace. Part 1: Introducing the Atom.
Atoms for Peace. Part 2: Medicine.
Atoms for Peace. Part 3: Agriculture, Industry, and Power.
Atoms for Peace. Part 4: Scientific Advancement.
Atoms for Peace. Part 5: Working Together.
Atoms for Peace. Part 6: Training Men for the Atomic Age.
Battle in the Tarai.
Bennington College.
Blue Ribbon.
Businessmen's Service Club.
Clean Water Makes Good Health.
A Community Advisory Service.
County Government.
Design for Growing.
Etawah Story.
Ethiopia in the Free World.
Expanding World Relationships.
Factory Worker Turns Farmer.
A Fair Chance.
The Family of Man.
The Greatest Treasure.
The Haven.
Head of the House.
Helping Teachers To Understand Children, Part 1.
Helping Teachers To Understand Children, Part 2.
Herald Tribune Youth Forum.
Himalayan Awakening.
Hoover Dam.
A House, a Wife, and a Singing Bird.
Hungarian Fight for Freedom.
Hurricane Circuit.
The Impressionable Years.
Impressions of Japan.
India Plows Deeper.
International Ice Patrol.
Journey Into Medicine.
Junior Chamber of Commerce.
Junior College for Technical Trades.
The Korea Story.
Let Us Live.
Letter From an American Schoolboy.

¹ USIA films are produced specifically for overseas use and USIA does not distribute copies in the United States. It releases certain films through the United States Office of Education for use in American schools and colleges. The office, in turn, authorizes United World Films to make and sell copies per GSA contract GS-COS-17375. School and university film libraries purchase copies and lend or rent them to educational film users.

Life for the Land.
Museum of Science and Industry.
A Nation in Torment.
The Near Horizon.
Now We Are Free.
Out of Hungary to Freedom.
Out of the Darkness.
Passport Issued.
The Photographer.
Planning for Plenty.
Preparation of Teachers.
Pursuit of Happiness.
Rehabilitation of the Blind.
Rescue Squad.
Revolt of a Generation.
Rosary of the Missions.
Rural High School.
Rural Women.
The Scroll.
Shipbuilders of Essex.
Small Town Editor.
Tanglewood, Music School and Music Festival.
Tom Schuler, Cobbler Statesman.
Toward Tomorrow.
Trailer 201.
Training of Men.
UCLA.
Union Local.
Vice President Nixon, Ambassador of Friendship.
Victory in Tarai.
Voice of a Choir.
We Build a Town.
The Yukawa Story.
Americans All.
Atacama Desert.
Belo Horizonte.
The Bounteous Earth.
Brazil.
Brazil Gets the News.
Brazilian Quartz Goes to War.
Brazil's Fishing School.
Buenos Aires and Montevideo.
Colombia, Crossroads of the Americas.
The County Agent.
Cuernavaca.
The Day Is New.
The Doctor.
Down Where North Begins.
Fiestas of the Hills.
Fire and Water.
Fundo in Chile.
Good Neighbor Family.
Guadalajara.
Heart of the Inca Empire.
High Plain.
High Spots of a High Country.
Hill Towns of Guatemala.
Hookworm.
Housing in Chile.
Insects as Carriers of Disease.
Jungle Quest for the Great Stone Heads.
Lima.
The Mechanic.
Mexico Builds a Democracy.
Mexico City.
Montevideo Family.
Monuments of Ancient Mexico.
Ohio Town.
Orchids.
Our Neighbors Down the Road.
Pan American Bazaar.
Paraguay.
Patagonian Playground.
Patzcuaro.
La Paz.
People of Two Worlds.
Peru.
Peru's Coastal Region.
Rio de Janeiro
São Paulo
The School
Schools of the South
Sky Dancers of Papantla
South Chile
Southern Brazil
Sundays in the Valley of Mexico
Tehuantepec
This Is Ecuador
A Town in Old Mexico
Treasure Trove of Jade

Venezuela
 Vera Cruz
 Wealth of the Andes
 Wings Over Brazil
 Wooden Faces of Totonacapan
 Young Uruguay
 Yucatan
 The Amazon Awakens
 Defense Against Invasion
 The Grain That Built a Hemisphere
 How Disease Travels
 The Human Body
 Infant Care
 Tuberculosis
 Water, Friend or Enemy
 What Is Disease
 Cleanliness Brings Health
 Winged Scourge
 A Better Tomorrow
 Capital Story
 The Cunningham Story
 Freedom To Learn
 Hymn of the Nations
 The Library of Congress
 Northwest U. S. A.
 San Francisco, 1945
 Steel Town
 Swedes in America
 The Town
 Tuesday in November
 Valley of the Tennessee
 Adult education
 Audio-visual aids to learning
 Bent with the years
 Board of education
 Books for everyone
 Brooklyn Technical High School
 Burroughs newsboy foundation
 Cancer education
 The CARE story
 Children's guardian
 Citizen's public hall
 Community Chest
 Creative leisure
 The Economic and Social Council at work
 Education for peace
 The family
 For a bright home life
 Freedom of the press
 How to conduct a meeting
 Independent commercial radio station
 International House
 Japan and the U. N.: What is the U. N.?
 Japanese Diet members observe United States Government in action
 Japanese Diet members visit an American legislature
 Japanese trade fair
 Japanese women leaders visit the United States
 Junior achievement
 Leaders of tomorrow
 Letter to a friend
 Libraries without bars
 Men who fish
 Museums for school children
 My child is blind
 NYU television workshop
 National Folk Festival, part 1
 National Folk Festival, part 2
 National Folk Festival, part 3
 A new beginning
 New eyes and new ears
 Our town is our classroom
 Road to peace
 The rural co-op
 SCAP and CI and E information centers
 Small town library
 Social change in a democracy
 The social worker
 A story of goodwill
 Streptomycin
 TVA Town
 This Land Is Mine
 Town Meeting of the World
 Tulsa, Oklahoma
 UNESCO and Japan
 Union and the Community
 We, the Japanese People
 Will for Peace
 Working Through College.

World in a Schoolroom.
 A Year in America.
 Roads and Traffic.
 Small Town Newspaper.
 Smog: The Pittsburgh Story.
 How America Shops.
 Automation.
 Presidential Conventions.
 Farming.
 Home Buying.
 Immigrants.
 State Capital.
 Problems of Leisure.
 Old Age: A Generation of Elder.
 Railroads.
 Air Traffic.

THE DISTRIBUTION AND USE IN THE UNITED STATES OF USIA FILMS

BACKGROUND

In a letter dated June 23, 1948, to the Assistant Secretary of State, the Commissioner of Education referred to the motion pictures being produced by the Department for use in its overseas programs and expressed the wish that such films could be made available through the Office of Education for noncommercial educational use in the United States. On July 29, 1948, the Assistant Secretary acquiesced and suggested that representatives of the Office of Education and of the Department's International Motion Picture Division work out the necessary arrangements. Copies of these two letters are attached.

CURRENT PROCEDURES

1. The United States Information Agency determines which of its films, produced or acquired for overseas use, can and should be released for educational use in the United States, taking into account legal factors and policy considerations. The Office of Education exercises no control in the selection of such films.
2. The United States Information Agency authorizes the Office of Education to release specific films for public educational use in this country. A copy of a representative letter is attached.
3. The Office of Education authorizes United World Films, Inc., to make copies of such films, utilizing for this purpose negatives of the Government, and to sell these copies in accordance with the provisions of contract GS-OOS-17375. A copy of a representative letter is attached.
4. United World Films notifies schools, colleges, and other users of educational films of the availability of the USIA films so released and fills purchase orders for copies of the films.
5. United World Films sends to the Office of Education monthly summaries of such sales, including duplicate copies of all sales invoices. The Office keeps a statistical record of sales but sends the invoices, which contain the names and addresses of purchasers, to the United States Information Agency for its information and reference file.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
 Washington, June 23, 1948.

Mr. GEORGE V. ALLEN,
 Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: The United States Office of Education is charged, in its organic act, with the responsibility "to diffuse such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

In carrying out this responsibility the Office of Education performs many services for American schools and colleges. One of these services, which has grown rapidly in recent years, is that of making available to educational institutions motion pictures and other visual aids of the United States

Government. At the present time, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Navy Department, and a number of other agencies and departments have released certain films to the Office of Education for distribution to the public to be used for educational purposes.

We have had numerous inquiries about the availability of the motion pictures of the Department of State. These inquiries express the belief of school and college officials that these films, showing various aspects of American life, would be particularly useful in American education. For example, concerning your recently completed picture on teacher education in the United States, the President of Ball State Teachers College has written us saying:

"We have had the privilege this past week-end of viewing the world premier of Teacher Training, U. S. A., prepared for the United States Department of State by the International Film Foundation of which Julien Bryan is director.

"As you know this film was made on the Ball State Teachers College campus last year. We are professionally proud of the film because we believe that it portrays the essence of a teacher education program based on the concept of child development and on the concept that the teacher is a well-rounded person. Both of these concepts are vividly portrayed in the movie.

"We know that the picture was made to be used by the United States Department of State in the USIS program as one of a group of documentary films to be shown in foreign countries. However, we should like to use the film for pre-service and in-service education on our campus and in the State of Indiana.

"We believe the film would be very useful for many college and public-school systems in the development of their programs. For some reason which we do not fully understand, documentary films of this type, with some exceptions, are not made available by the State Department to educational institutions or to anyone in the United States. Since there would be no cost to the State Department and since we do not intend to sell or lease the movie, we would be interested in having you find out for us if it is at all possible for us to obtain three copies of the movie which could be used for local and State meetings."

In order to meet such requests and thus to promote the cause of education, the Office of Education urges that the Department of State, if possible, make its films available to the Office of Education for use in its program of assistance to educational institutions in this country. The use of the films will, of course, be limited strictly to noncommercial educational purposes.

I hope that it will be possible for our Visual Aids to Education Section and your International Motion Picture Division to work cooperatively in effecting such arrangements as may be necessary to make certain of your motion pictures available domestically. It seems to me particularly important that films such as yours on various aspects of American life be widely used in American schools and colleges at the present time to help bring about in American youth a better understanding of and a greater faith in American democracy.

Cordially yours,
 J. W. STUDEBAKER, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
 Washington, July 29, 1948.

Mr. RALL I. GRIGSBY,
 Acting Commissioner,
 United States Office of Education,
 Federal Security Agency,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRIGSBY: The receipt is acknowledged of Mr. Studebaker's letter of June 23, 1948, proposing that this Department make available to the Office of Educa-

tion for distribution in this country motion picture productions mentioned in the letter, the display of which it is believed would " * * * diffuse * * * information * * * and * * * promote the cause of education throughout the country." Use of the films concerned would, the letter states, be limited strictly to noncommercial educational purposes.

This Department is pleased to agree to the suggestion so made. There are, of course, certain conditions to be observed in respect to these films and therefore it is desirable that, as suggested in the letter under acknowledgement, representatives of your office take the matter up with Mr. Herbert T. Edwards, Chief of the Department's International Motion Pictures Division. They will doubtless be able to work out all necessary arrangements.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, June 4, 1958.
UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION,
Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will authorize the United States Office of Education to release for public, nonprofit distribution and exhibition within the United States, including the sale of prints by United World Films under contract GS-OOS-17375, the following motion pictures:

The Grain That Built a Hemisphere.
Water: Friend or Enemy.
Defense Against Invasion.
The Amazon Awakens.
The Human Body.
What Is Disease?
Tuberculosis.
Infant Care.
How Disease Travels.

Sincerely yours,

JACK W. EVANS,
Special Assistant to Director,
Motion Picture Service.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1958.

Mr. LEO B. GUELPA, Jr.,
Manager, Government Films Department,
United World Films, Inc., New
York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GUELPA: This will authorize United World Films, Inc., in accordance with the terms and conditions of contract GS-OOS-17375, to make and sell 16-millimeter prints of the following motion pictures:

	Price per print	Government
List		ment
The Amazon Awakens (color, 1,203')	\$177.73	\$133.30
Defense Against Invasion (color, 487')	73.95	55.46
The Grain That Built a Hemisphere (color, 411')	64.56	47.67
How Disease Travels (color, 396')	57.21	42.91
The Human Body (color, 357')	51.87	38.90
Infant Care (color, 338')	49.29	36.97
Tuberculosis (color, 388')	56.13	42.10
Water, Friend or Enemy (color, 333')	48.60	36.45
What Is Disease? (color, 408')	63.16	47.37

These motion pictures, originally produced by the Office of Inter-American Affairs, should be listed in catalogs and in sales reports as films of the United States Information Agency.

Printing materials are located at Byron, Inc., and United World Films, Inc., is hereby

authorized to purchase prints for \$0.072 per foot plus \$1 per reel (400 feet or fraction thereof). The sales prices quoted above have been calculated upon these laboratory prices in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 12 of contract GS-OOS-17375.

Sincerely yours,

SEERLEY REID,
Chief, Visual Education Service.

And Ambassador Allen had testified before the committee: "There are excellent films in the USIA film catalog which Americans would like to see but we do not allow them to do so."

The situation in which the Congress and the American taxpayers find themselves today points up what I have been saying on the floor of this House for years. I want a good powerful United States Information Agency and I want a good powerful Voice of America on the airwaves. The crowd running this outfit have not had the ability to achieve either of these desires. I have said a number of times here on the floor that if the United States Information Agency were doing a good job and needed the money I would be willing to appropriate a billion dollars a year. But I cannot condone the extraordinary procedure adopted by the administration in this instance. I repeat the charge that in order to deliberately avoid hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, this administration and the Agency resorted to the gimmick of waiting until testimony was taken on the regular bill and again only recently on the pending supplemental appropriations bill, and then after the House had sent this bill to the other body sent up this request. Are they afraid to answer questions? Are they afraid to put their cards on the table and place the responsibility for the fiasco of the Voice of America where it belongs?

I again submit that if the \$10 million contained in the pending motion of the gentleman from Ohio is worthy of an affirmative vote which would start construction of at least a \$27 million project, then the entire amount requested by the Agency, to wit, \$22,300,000 is justified.

Regardless of the outcome of the vote on the pending motion, I intend to request a thoroughgoing investigation of this whole situation by the investigations staff of the House Appropriations Committee.

Finally, I suggest to Ambassador Allen that he take the United States Information Agency people, who are lobbying like demons for bigger USIA appropriations and this very item, off Capitol Hill at the first moment. There are entirely too many USIA lobbyists whose large salaries are paid with taxpayers' money whose only job seems to me to be to get bigger and greater appropriations for the Agency. I am reliably informed that in the past number of days the Secretary of the Interior has personally called almost all the Members on the other side of the aisle lobbying for passage of the minerals subsidy pilferage of the taxpayers' pockets. Is not there someone who has the ear of the President of the United States to inform him as to what is going on in the premises?

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 172, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—190

Adair	Dorn, N. Y.	Mumma
Addonizio	Durham	Neal
Allen, Calif.	Dwyer	Nimtz
Allen, Ill.	Farbstein	Nix
Anfuso	Fenton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Fino	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Ford	Osmer
Auchincloss	Fulton	Ostertag
Avery	George	Patterson
Ayres	Glenn	Pelly
Baldwin	Granahan	Price
Barden	Green, Pa.	Quie
Barrett	Griffin	Ray
Bass, N. H.	Griffiths	Reece, Tenn.
Bates	Gubser	Reed
Becker	Gwinn	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hagen	Reuss
Betts	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Harden	Rhodes, Pa.
Bolling	Harvey	Riehlman
Bolton	Haskell	Roberts
Bonner	Hays, Ark.	Robison, N. Y.
Bosch	Hays, Ohio	Robison, Ky.
Bow	Heseltun	Rodino
Boyle	Hess	Rogers, Colo.
Bray	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Broomfield	Hill	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Saund
Broyhill	Holmes	Saylor
Bush	Holt	Schenck
Byrd	Holtzman	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	Horan	Scott, N. C.
Cannfield	Hyde	Scudder
Carnahan	Jensen	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Judd	Selden
Cederberg	Karsten	Simpson, Pa.
Chamberlain	Kean	Sisk
Chenoweth	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Christopher	Kelly, N. Y.	Springer
Church	Knox	Staggers
Clark	Knutson	Stauffer
Cooley	Lafore	Taber
Corbett	Laird	Talle
Cramer	Latham	Teague, Calif.
Cretella	Lennon	Tewes
Cunningham	Lesinski	Thompson, N. Y.
Iowa	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Cunningham	McGovern	Tollefson
Nebr.	McGregor	Trimble
Curtin	McIntosh	Udall
Curtis, Mass.	Machrowicz	Ullman
Curtis, Mo.	Maillard	Van Zandt
Dague	Martin	Vorys
Dawson, Utah	May	Vursell
Delaney	Merrow	Westland
Dellay	Michel	Whitener
Dennison	Miller, Md.	Widnall
Dent	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Devereux	Moore	Withrow
Diggs	Morano	Wolverton
Dixon	Morgan	Younger
Dollinger	Moss	Zablocki
Dooley	Moulder	Zelenko

NAYS—172

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson
Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Elliott
Albert	Brown, Mo.	Everett
Alexander	Budge	Evins
Alger	Burleson	Fallon
Andersen	Byrne, Ill.	Fascell
H. Carl	Byrnes, Wis.	Felghan
Andrews	Cannon	Fisher
Ashmore	Celler	Flood
Aspinall	Chelf	Flynt
Bailey	Coad	Fogarty
Baring	Collier	Forand
Bass, Tenn.	Davis, Ga.	Forrester
Beckworth	Davis, Tenn.	Fountain
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson, Ill.	Frazier
Bennett, Mich.	Denton	Garmatz
Berry	Dingell	Gary
Blitch	Donohue	Gathings
Boggs	Dorn, S. C.	Gavin
Boland	Dowdy	Grant
Breeding	Eberharter	Gray

Green, Oreg.
Gross
Haley
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Healey
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kruger
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Libonati
Lipscomb
Loser
McFall

McMillan
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Meador
Metcalf
Mills
Mitchell
Montoya
Morris
Multer
Murray
Natcher
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Porter
Rabaut
Riley
Rivers

Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Santangelo
Scherer
Scribner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Sullivan
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tuck
Van Pelt
Vinson
Walton
Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates

NOT VOTING—67

Anderson, Mont.
Baker
Baumhart
Beamer
Bentley
Boykin
Brooks, La.
Brownson
Buckley
Burdick
Clevenger
Coffin
Colmer
Coudert
Derounian
Dies
Doyle
Engle
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gordon
Gregory

Hale
Harrison, Nebr.
Hébert
Henderson
Hillings
Hoffman
Hosmer
James
Jenkins
Jones, Mo.
Kearney
Kilburn
LeCompte
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McIntire
Macdonald
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morrison

Pilcher
Powell
Preston
Prouty
Radwan
Rains
St. George
Scott, Pa.
Sheehan
Shuford
Sieminski
Spence
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Utt
Vanik
Wainwright
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Young

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. James for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Friedel against.
Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Vanik against.
Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Engle against.
Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Pilcher against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Preston against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Doyle against.
Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Young against.
Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Rains against.
Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Gordon against.
Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Boykin against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Macdonald against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.
Mr. Minshall for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.
Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Coffin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Beamer.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Utt.

Messrs. DURHAM, McGOVERN, CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, McDONOUGH, CUNNINGHAM of Iowa, DORN of New York, ALLEN of Illinois, MILLER of Nebraska, REECE of Tennessee, and RHODES of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. CELLER, HEALEY, MULTER, METCALF, and SMITH of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 112.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 45, line 1, insert:

"Payment to informational media guaranty fund"

"For payment to the 'Informational media guaranty fund', for partial restoration of realized impairment to the capital used in carrying on the authority to make informational media guaranties, as provided in section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1442), \$5,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND EURATOM

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 116) to approve agreement between the Government of the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community—Euratom—concerning cooperation to advance the peaceful application of atomic energy.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has instituted a program of international cooperation to make available to cooperating nations the benefits of peaceful applications of atomic energy; and

Whereas the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) have entered into an agreement providing for cooperation in programs designed to advance the peaceful application of atomic energy: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That pursuant to the provisions of sections 11 (1) and 124 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), signed at Brussels on May 29, 1958, and at Washington on June 19, 1958, concerning cooperation between the parties in programs for the advancement of the peaceful application of atomic energy,

be and hereby is approved. This resolution does not constitute approval or disapproval of the memorandum of understanding, or any other agreements which have not been formally approved or authorized by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 376 and its companion, Senate Concurrent Resolution 116, in accordance with the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, provide for Congressional approval of the international agreement establishing a United States-Euratom cooperation program signed at Brussels on May 29, 1958, and in Washington on June 19, 1958. These resolutions specifically provide that they do not constitute approval or disapproval of what is designated as the memorandum of understanding or any other agreements which have not been formally approved or authorized by Congress.

The European Atomic Energy Community, shortened to Euratom, was established in 1957 by Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Its aim is to bring those countries together in a cooperative effort toward the speedy establishment and growth of nuclear industries. More particularly, it is vitally interested in getting an atomic-electric power industry going in Europe to supplement dwindling conventional power sources on the Continent and eventually to relieve Europe of the vicissitudes of reliance on Mid-East and other oil imports to fuel substantial portions of its domestic and industrial electricity capacity.

Euratom is roughly similar to the European Iron and Steel Community which has been operating successfully in connection with these ferrous metals. It is not a superstate, but it is more than a mere treaty between the nations involved.

The international agreement these resolutions seek to approve is a rather short document, merely reciting that the parties will cooperate in programs for the advancement of the peaceful applications of atomic energy. It says that such cooperation will be undertaken from time to time pursuant to such terms and conditions as may be agreed and shall be subject to all provisions of law applicable to the parties to it. Specifically, it recites that any cooperation undertaken by the United States will be done only pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

To spell this out then, what these resolutions seek to approve is merely the international agreement. The interna-

tional agreement, in turn, is a somewhat loose declaration that the parties will cooperate on peaceful applications of atomic energy in ways that will be agreed upon later. Such later agreements would, insofar as our Government is concerned, be wrapped up in what section 123 of our Atomic Energy Act calls an "agreement for cooperation." As such, it could not be executed unless the President determines in writing that it "will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security." Nor can it go into effect until it has been before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 30 days, during which it will be examined and if found wanting in any respect be subject to the Joint Committee's disapproval.

Now, when the Joint Committee received the international agreement, it also received a lengthy proposed draft of an agreement for cooperation to follow it up. This proposal recites a number of whereases and contains 16 detailed articles. Appended to it were a number of annexes and memoranda of understanding going into further detail on numerous financial and technical points. I emphasize that this was only a proposed draft, the draft of the proposed agreement for cooperation was not signed, only initialed.

These documents were presented along with the international agreement for three principal reasons. First, to give the Congress a context in which to evaluate the international agreement. Second, to initiate discussion between the executive and legislative branches directed eventually at achieving mutual approval of text for an agreement for cooperation. Third, to obtain legislative authorization during this session of Congress of basic first steps of the contemplated cooperation.

The latter are embodied in S. 4273 passed by the other body yesterday and its companion H. R. 13749 to be before us later today.

It was not deemed feasible at this late time in the session to fully evaluate the draft proposal of any agreement for cooperation. That is why the resolution before us now specifically sets forth that it does not constitute an approval or disapproval of the memoranda of understanding or the draft agreement for cooperation. These matters will be gone into by the Joint Committee thoroughly next year. Meanwhile, however, as I mentioned, certain basic first steps which the Joint Committee felt necessary for the purposes of later cooperation, and desirable from the standpoint of our international relations, will be before us shortly in the form of H. R. 13749.

After careful consideration of these proposals over a long period of hearings by the Joint Committee, I am satisfied they are in the best interests of the United States of America, am supporting them, and urge this body to enact both House Concurrent Resolution 376, before us now, approving the international agreement, and H. R. 13749 which will come up shortly to authorize initial steps in our cooperation with Euratom.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 376 is merely a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress that the agreement between the Government of the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community, known as Euratom, is approved.

The text of the agreement recommended to be approved is set forth at pages 2 and 3 of the Joint Committee report on this resolution. The agreement is merely a general statement that the parties will cooperate in programs for the advancement of the peaceful applications of atomic energy. Moreover, the agreement, in article I states:

Specifically it is understood that under existing law the cooperation extended by the Government of the United States of America will be undertaken pursuant to an Agreement for Cooperation entered into in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Therefore, as further cooperation is undertaken, necessary authorization and appropriations must be obtained from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House should approve the concurrent resolution as the first step in a program of cooperation to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy which should be of great benefit both to the Western European countries and also to the United States. It will provide orders for United States manufacturers to sell our types of reactors, and will also represent a step forward in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote for approval of House Concurrent Resolution 376.

COOPERATION WITH EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4273) to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958."

Sec. 2. As used in this act—

(a) "The Community" means the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).

(b) The "Commission" means the Atomic Energy Commission, as established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

(c) "Joint program" means the cooperative program established by the Community and the United States and carried out in accordance with the provisions of an agreement for cooperation entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to bring into operation in the territory of the members of the Community powerplants using nuclear reactors of types selected by the Commission and the Community, having as a goal a total installed capacity of approximately 1 million kilowatts of electricity by December 31, 1963, except that 2 reactors may be selected to be in operation by December 31, 1965.

(d) All other terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as terms described in

section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of \$3 million as an initial authorization for fiscal year 1959 for use in a cooperative program of research and development in connection with the types of reactors selected by the Commission and the Community under the joint program. The Commission may enter into contracts for such periods as it deems necessary, but in no event to exceed 5 years, for the purpose of conducting the research and development program authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the Community authorizes an equivalent amount for use in the cooperative program of research and development.

Sec. 4. The Commission is authorized, within limits of amounts which may hereafter be authorized to be appropriated in accordance with the provisions of section 261 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to make guaranty contracts which shall in the aggregate not exceed a total contingent liability of \$90 million designed to assure that the charges to an operator of a reactor constructed under the joint program for fabricating, processing, and transporting fuel will be no greater than would result under the fuel fabricating and fuel life guaranties which the Commission shall establish for such reactor. Within the limits of such amounts, the Commission is authorized to make contracts under this section, without regard to the provisions of sections 3679 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for such periods of time as it determines to be necessary: *Provided, however*, That no such contracts may extend for a period longer than that necessary to cover fuel loaded into a reactor constructed under the joint program during the first 10 years of the reactor operation or prior to December 31, 1973 (or December 31, 1975, for not more than 2 reactors selected under section 2 (c)), whichever is earlier. In establishing criteria for the selection of projects and in entering into such guaranty contracts, the Commission shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following principles:

(a) The Commission shall encourage a strong and competitive atomic equipment manufacturing industry in the United States designed to provide diversified sources of supply for reactor parts and reactor fuel elements under the joint program;

(b) The guaranty shall be consistent with the provisions of this act and of attachment A to the memorandum of understanding between the Government of the United States and the Community, signed in Brussels on May 29, 1958, and in Washington, D. C., on June 12, 1958, and transmitted to Congress on June 23, 1958;

(c) The Commission shall establish and publish minimum levels of fuel element cost and life to be guaranteed by the manufacturer as a basis for inviting and evaluating proposals;

(d) The guaranty by the manufacturer shall be as favorable as any other guaranty offered by the manufacturer for any comparable fuel element within a reasonable time period; and

(e) The Commission shall obtain a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for governmental purposes to any patents on inventions or discoveries made or conceived by the manufacturer in the course of development or fabrication of fuel elements during the period covered by the Commission's guaranty.

Sec. 5. Pursuant to the provisions of section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there is hereby authorized for sale or lease to the Community:

Thirty thousand kilograms of contained uranium 235

One kilogram of plutonium in accordance with the provisions of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Community entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended: *Provided*, That the Government of the United States obtains the equivalent of a first lien on any such material sold to the Community for which payment is not made in full at the time of transfer.

SEC. 6. (a) The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire from the Community special nuclear material or any interest therein from reactors constructed under the joint program in accordance with the terms of an agreement for cooperation entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended: *Provided*, That neither plutonium nor uranium 233 nor any interest therein shall be acquired under this section in excess of the total quantities authorized by law. The Commission is hereby authorized to acquire from the Community pursuant to this section up to 4,100 kilograms of plutonium for use only for peaceful purposes.

(b) Any contract made under the provisions of this section to acquire plutonium or any interest therein may be at such prices and for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That with respect to plutonium produced in any reactor constructed under the joint program, no such contract shall be for a period greater than 10 years of operation of such reactors or December 31, 1973 (or December 31, 1975, for not more than 2 reactors selected under section 2 (c)), whichever is earlier: *And provided further*, That no such contract shall provide for compensation or the payment of a purchase price in excess of the Commission's established price in effect at the time of delivery to the Commission for such material as fuel in a nuclear reactor.

(c) Any contract made under the provisions of this section to acquire uranium enriched in the isotope uranium 235 may be at such price and for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That no such contract shall be for a period of time extending beyond the terminal date of the agreement for cooperation with the Community or provide for the acquisition of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in excess of the quantities of such material that have been distributed to the Community by the Commission less the quantity consumed in the nuclear reactors involved in the joint program: *And provided further*, That no such contract shall provide for compensation or the payment of a purchase price in excess of the Atomic Energy Commission's established charges for such material in effect at the time delivery is made to the Commission.

(d) Any contract made under this section for the purchase of special nuclear material or any interest therein may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

(e) Any contract made under this section may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.

SEC. 7. The Government of the United States of America shall not be liable for any damages or third party liability arising out of or resulting from the joint program: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall deprive any person of any rights under section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The Government of the United States shall take such steps as

may be necessary, including appropriate disclaimer or indemnity arrangements, in order to carry out the provisions of this section.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 376 (S. Con. Res. 116) is a concurrent resolution to approve the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community—referred to as Euratom—which has been signed and submitted to the Congress in accordance with the requirements of sections 11 (1) and 124 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

H. R. 13749—S. 4273—is a bill to provide for the first step in this cooperation. It allows the program to get started, but further implementation can be carried out only after further authorization from the Congress.

This bill authorizes to be appropriated \$3 million for use in the cooperative research and development program, to be matched by an equivalent amount by the Euratom countries.

This bill also provides in section 4 for a guarantee program whereby the Commission will back up guaranties on fuel elements costs and performance made by United States of America manufacturers to the Euratom customers. Through this means United States of America manufacturers will get orders, and the Euratom user will receive a guaranty as to the cost and performance of the fuel element. The maximum contingent liability as provided in the bill for this guaranty program will be \$90 million and if the United States of America manufacturers can make good guaranties, the cost to the Commission will be much less. In all cases, the Commission will require a guaranty by the United States of America manufacturer, and the Commission's guaranty will be only a backup, or supplemental, guaranty.

I would like to make one thing clear about this guaranty program in section 4 of the bill and that is this:

Section 4 authorizes no funds at this time, and funds will be authorized only after submission to the Joint Committee of more information as to each proposed contract, and further authorization by the Congress.

The remaining sections of the bill provide for sale of fuel—section 5, for acquisition of special nuclear material—section 6, and a provision that the Government of the United States shall not be liable for any damage or third party liability—section 7. These provisions have been closely scrutinized by the Joint Committee and are considered essential or desirable to carry out this worthwhile program.

The goal of the Euratom countries is to bring into operation atomic-power reactors of United States types of a million kilowatts in operation by 1963. The Joint Committee provided in the bill for a permissive modification of this goal so that two reactors might be brought into operation by December 31, 1965, if, in the combined technical judgment of the Commission and the Community, such a change would be desirable.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy carefully scrutinized every provision in the original recommended bill, and made a number of important changes. These were done, with the concurrence of the executive branch, in order to provide authorization for what is needed right now, but nothing more than that. Further authorization and appropriations must be obtained from the Congress as particular projects are firmed up in the program.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the final paragraph of the comments of the Joint Committee as set forth in the committee's report:

6. Conclusion: The Joint Committee, after many days and hours of testimony and consideration of the program, reached agreement on the language of a bill to provide for the initial stages of cooperation with Euratom. The Joint Committee believes that implementation of this program will constitute an important step forward both in our foreign policy and in the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

This program will provide for close cooperation with Euratom, will cost the United States taxpayers comparatively little, and will assist our own manufacturers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF GUARANTY PROGRAM UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE BILL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, section 4 authorizes the Commission, within limits of amounts hereafter authorized, to make guaranty contracts which shall in the aggregate not exceed a total contingent liability of \$90 million, designed to assure that the charges to a Euratom operator will be no greater than charges which would result under guaranties established by the Commission. For reactors in this program the Commission has established the following guaranties:

Fuel life or performance: 10,000 megawatt days per ton—for stainless steel or zirconium clad elements.

Fuel fabrication cost: \$100 per kilogram of contained uranium—for fuel elements using stainless steel cladding—or \$140 per kilogram of contained uranium—for fuel elements using zirconium cladding. See attachment A to memo of understanding, page 19 of Joint Committee print.

The maximum contingent liability which the Commission may assume under section 4 of the bill is \$90 million. As indicated at pages 467-469 of part II of the hearings, this maximum figure was calculated on the basis of a manufacturer's guaranty as to performance of 7,000 megawatt days per ton; and a manufacturer's guaranty as to fuel element fabrication costs of \$120—stainless steel cladding—or \$150—zirconium cladding. For example, if the manufacturer guarantees 7,000 megawatt days, the Commission's contingent liability would apply to only 3,000 megawatt days.

If the United States of America manufacturers are able to make better guar-

anties as to fuel element life and cost than those in the above paragraph upon which the calculations were based, the Commission's contingent liability will be correspondingly reduced below the \$90 million figure. Many experts feel, especially as to fuel element life, that the manufacturers will be able to obtain better than 7,000 megawatt days, and hence that the Commission's contingent liability will be correspondingly reduced.

Further details on the operation of the guaranty are set out at page 240 of the hearings.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H. R. 13749, is a clean bill, altering in many respects the original AEC proposed bill initiating our program of cooperation with Euratom. The measure ties future control of any such cooperative program to Congress and gives us ample opportunity, step by step, to see where we are going in this direction, and, if circumstances warrant, either go ahead, change course, or stop.

The overall goal of the United States-Euratom program is the construction by 1963 of some five full-scale American-type atomic plants in the Euratom countries, or some of them at least. These countries include Belgium, West Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

These plants would have an aggregate capacity of about 1 million electric kilowatts, and would cost an estimated \$350 million. Euratom proposes to finance the venture with \$150 million from the utility companies building the plants, which represents the cost of building conventionally fueled plants of equivalent kilowatt capacity, by an Export-Import bank loan of \$135 million, and a European bank loan of the balance of \$65 million. The United States would contribute \$50 million on a matching basis for research and development work over a 5-year period, subject to an extension of the program for 5 years on the same basis; guarantee fuel performance costs under a contingent liability up to \$90 million; and sell Euratom 30,000 kilograms of U-235 under a long term arrangement.

Now to discuss these United States commitments authorized by this bill. The bill authorizes expenditure of \$3 million in the current fiscal year, providing Euratom puts up an equivalent amount, for cooperative research and development work aimed at perfecting fuel elements and other portions of the reactors that will be built under the program. I would not say that this specific work would not be done by the Atomic Energy Commission anyway, but it is the general type of thing AEC aims at, so it is inevitable that the results of the program will not only relieve other budget accounts of at least a portion of their responsibilities in this regard, but they will also enhance our own techniques in the production of nuclear electricity.

The bill authorizes AEC to negotiate what are actually United States Government guaranties that the reactor fuel elements will produce a certain minimum amount of heat and will not cost more than a certain maximum amount. What this provision amounts to can best be explained by comparing it with automobile liability insurance. If you get into an automobile accident and the other fellow gets a judgment against you, the insurance company pays the judgment up to the limits of your policy. If you do not get into an accident, the insurance company pays out nothing and keeps your premiums.

So in this instance, if the fuel elements produce the minimum amount of heat and they are sold to Euratom for not more than a certain amount of money, the United States Government pays out nothing. If these specifications are not met, then the Government is liable, but only if the manufacturer's individual guaranty on these products does not satisfy the deficiency. The total amount of contingent liability which can be incurred is \$90 million—if everything goes wrong, which is highly unlikely. Further than that, no contract for any part of the total may be signed until authorization and appropriation authority is later granted by this Congress.

Although some may differ with me, I have sufficient confidence in the abilities of our scientists and engineers to believe they will produce fuel elements that not only meet, but exceed the specifications, and that we may be called upon to pony up under the guaranties only in those rare instances where some highly unusual and unexpected difficulty is encountered. The reactors called for by this program are not experimental in nature, but types which are proven at the time the go-ahead is given on them. Looking back over the progress of the last 5 years in reactor technology, and realizing that we now look ahead from a much firmer and broader base of knowledge. I cannot help but feel confident these guaranties will not prove difficult for us. Yet, I can, putting myself in the position of the purchasers of these reactors, see why they would be adamant about committing themselves to the program without them.

Before leaving the subject, and for those technically inclined, I will explain that the bill incorporates by reference attachment A of the memorandum of understanding between the United States and the Euratom people which provides a guaranty of fuel elements in water reactors at an average irradiation level of 10,000 megawatt days per metric ton of contained uranium. It also provides the maximum charge for fuel elements of certain dimensions with stainless steel cladding of not over \$100 per kilogram of contained uranium, and the maximum charge for similar fuel elements clad with zirconium of not over \$140 a kilogram. Provision is made for the adjustment of charges having different claddings, dimensions, or uranium enrichment.

The bill authorizes the AEC to sell or lease 30,000 kilograms—roughly 75,000 pounds—of U-235 to Euratom. The

plan is to sell an initial reactor inventory of 9,000 kilograms on a 10-20 year deferred payment basis with interest at 4 percent, with payment for the remaining 21,000 kilograms to be made "cash on the barrelhead" at time of transfer. To protect United States interest in the inventory, the bill provides that we shall have the equivalent of a first lien on the material.

Now somebody is going to ask how much that U-235 is going to cost, so I might as well say now that the figure is indeterminate until specifications of the fuel elements are made. This U-235 isotope constitutes up about one one-hundred-fortieth of the atoms of uranium. Practically all the rest are U-238. The uranium in these reactors will contain a greater percentage of the U-235 isotope, or will be what is known as enriched uranium. The degree of enrichment determines the cost. So, although the enriched uranium we sell for the reactors will contain in all, 30,000 kilograms of the U-235 isotope, the specific degree of enrichment will determine not only how much total uranium is involved, but also the aggregate price. The greater the degree of enrichment, the greater the price. So it ends up with the apparent anomaly that the less uranium we sell them, the more it will cost because it will contain a greater percentage of precious U-235.

Whatever this price is, it will be the same as we will sell to domestic users. I hope I made my discussion of the fuel guaranties sufficiently clear to make it apparent that this price has a bearing on the guaranties, since the guaranties involve maximum costs of the fuel elements based on their amount of contained uranium.

Another provision of the bill deals with the plutonium that is created as a by-product of operating the reactors. As you know, the fission process involves the release of neutrons which in some instances act to transmute U-238 into Pu-239, or plutonium. Buy-back provisions permit the AEC to acquire up to 4,100 kilograms of such plutonium produced by the program reactors.

In original drafts the bill provided only that proven type reactors could be considered in the program. This was a little indefinite as to whether the reactors had to be proven at the time we passed the legislation, or at the time the reactors were contracted for. The bill before us eliminates that ambiguity. As a byproduct of so doing, the target operational date for not more than two reactors was extended from 1963 to 1965. Such rapid progress is being made in the reactor art that it was felt undesirable to freeze for consideration only those types that are proven as of today. Also, such freezing would, as a practical matter, limit the firms eligible to furnish reactors to 2, or 3 at the most, depending on how you define proven.

In considering this legislation the Congress should be under no delusion that it will capture the entire European reactors market for United States suppliers. Although there are some that will disagree with me, it is my personal feeling that the bill goes no farther than making us

competitive in this market with the British. The British atomics industry can be loosely described as a government monopoly. They give fuel guaranties and other incentives that would prevent us from competing in the European market at all without such legislation as this before us today. Euratom is, in fact, also dicker with the British for some of their reactors.

Nor should any inference be drawn from this legislation that we will not be carrying on our own continued and considerable research and development in the reactor arts. I mentioned that the research and development features of this program might relieve a portion of other budget accounts of some of their responsibilities, but I meant it only in the context that such relief would permit research and development along other important lines. We have reiterated time and again by statute and otherwise our belief that early attainment of economically feasible nuclear electricity is a major national objective. If we adhere to that belief it means not a slackening of effort, but the seizing upon every opportunity to forward it.

The bill provides, with respect to patents on inventions or discoveries made by the manufacturer while the fuel element guaranties are in effect, that the Government shall obtain a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for governmental purposes. In my own personal view, unless the Government is going into the business of producing nuclear electricity for sale, this provision is rather meaningless. However, it may be that patents on devices that are applicable to other governmental purposes, and also with respect to naval nuclear propulsion, might possibly be obtained and thus give the provision some meaning. At least, if it does not do us any good, it will not hurt us any.

The bill has provision that the United States Government is held immune for any damages or third-party liability arising from the joint program which are in the nature of a tort. The provision is so written that it does not deprive any one of his indemnity protection under terms of the Price-Anderson Act. This means essentially that while reactor components are being manufactured in the United States, say, that people would be protected from any incident to the extent that the Price-Anderson Act stipulates.

I believe the passage of this bill represents the minimum we must do in order to maintain the concept of cooperation in the field of peaceful atomic uses. As a Nation we have harped on this subject for a number of years. It seems to me we are now at the put up or shut up stage. The bill is so written that Congress will keep a fairly rigorous eye on and control over the future of this cooperation with Euratom, thus we do not write a blank check by approving it.

I recommend favorable action on the bill.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 13749, a bill to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community—Euratom—

to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am privileged to be a member, spent many hours of work and conscientious study on this bill. As carefully drafted by the Joint Committee, it permits the program to get started, but only authorizes to be appropriated \$3 million at the present time, and requires the Atomic Energy Commission to return to the Joint Committee and the Congress before receiving additional authorization for appropriation. As drafted, this bill will permit the appropriate agencies of the United States Government to proceed with the Euratom countries, and lay the groundwork for the program, and return to the Congress and explain it in more detail next session, and request authorization and appropriations at that time.

As for the \$3 million authorized in this bill for a cooperative program of research and development, there is a proviso that this \$3 million must be matched by the Euratom countries, and it is intended that all future amounts will also be matched, dollar for dollar, by the Euratom countries. This research and development money will then be used to improve fuel elements of United States type reactors and should result in tremendous benefits, both direct and indirect, to USA manufacturers. More importantly, this cooperative research and development program will help advance the leadership of the United States of America in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Section 4 of the bill provides the framework of a guaranty program which is essential because of the uncertainty of nuclear fuel element fabrication costs and performance at this time. No funds are authorized in section 4 of the bill, and authority is given only to lay the groundwork and to return to the Congress for specific authorizations and appropriations as each project is more specifically described in the future. This guaranty will be used by the Commission to back up and supplement guaranties offered by United States manufacturers in selling their products to Euratom customers. The guaranty is thus of direct benefit to United States manufacturers in allowing them to make sales of fuel elements at this time.

As I stated earlier, no funds are authorized at this time, and subsequent authorizations and appropriations must be obtained. However, the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses—who did an excellent job in presenting this complex subject to the Joint Committee—have testified that the maximum contingent liability to the Government will be no more than \$90 million, and this amount is provided in the bill as a limit or ceiling of maximum contingent liability.

I would like to emphasize that nothing is authorized in section 4 of the bill at this time, and that future authorizations and appropriations must be obtained. Also, the \$90 million is only a maximum contingent liability figure, and it is possible that the funds actually expended by the Commission in its guaranty will be considerably less than

this maximum possible contingent liability.

Mr. Speaker, cooperation with Euratom will help advance our atomic equipment manufacturing industry, and will add to United States prestige and leadership in this field. It will also provide for increased ties of economic and political cooperation with our closest Western European allies. The members of the Joint Committee have considered this program carefully and in great detail. We believe that it is a good program, and that this bill provides a good first step without going too far, and I join my colleagues of the Joint Committee in urging the House to approve H. R. 13749.

TO AMEND CHAPTER 223 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STABILIZING PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN MINERALS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 4036, with Mr. EVANS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] had 40 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 36 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] had been recognized for 6 minutes and had consumed 2 minutes of his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, this program is a hodgepodge of contradictory economic errors.

It will repeat all of the economic errors that we have committed in dealing with agricultural surpluses and add a few more errors.

The advocates of this bill say they have unemployment in their mining districts but also state that this bill is not intended to relieve unemployment.

This bill adopts the much ridiculed theory of granting Federal funds to cor-

porations on the theory that some small fraction of it will trickle down to relieve unemployment.

There are probably no more than 10,000 unemployed in the mining industry. The Nation has a total of 5 million unemployed. There are hundreds of thousands unemployed in the auto, coal, steel, and railroad industries alone.

Why should this small segment of the mining industry be selected for this colossal costly preferential treatment? How can we refuse to extend this same program of fixed prices and subsidy payments to thousands of other manufacturers and industries?

It is claimed that this bill will permit some marginal mines to remain open. But, the relief is not limited to the marginal producers. The bulk of this relief will go to a few highly prosperous mining and refining corporations.

Let us take a look at the tungsten market for an example of what this bill does.

We now have enough tungsten in our stockpiles to meet our needs for anywhere from 19 to 26 years.

The tungsten subsidy stockpile program has been a scandalous waste of tax money. The tungsten corporations have been selling second-grade inferior ores to the Federal Government at a price of between \$55 to \$65 a ton. This price is about \$20 a ton above market price.

The same corporations who were selling to the Federal Government were importing and using first-grade foreign tungsten at a price of \$35 a ton. This bill sets a fictitious subsidy of \$53 a ton. Both the State Department and the Department of the Interior recommended only \$48 a ton.

There have been some vague statements made here about giving relief to the mining corporations?

Let us see if they need relief.

I have here a copy of the July edition of *Fortune* magazine. This edition analyzes the profits for the year 1957 of the largest 500 corporations of this country.

Here are some facts taken from this analysis:

The average percentage profit of these 500 corporations based on sales was 5.6 percent.

The average percentage profit of the mining corporations was 11 percent.

This is nearly double that of the average corporation.

The average percentage profit of these 500 corporations on their investment capital was 11.4 percent.

The average percentage profit of the mining companies on invested capital was 12.8 percent.

The return and profit on investment capital for the Kennecott Copper Corp. was 32.4 percent.

The profit on investment capital for the National Lead & Zinc Co. was 20.3 percent.

These figures do not indicate any depressed financial condition in the mining industry.

There is some truth to the statement made here that it is expensive to reopen a mine if it is once closed down.

That is true, but the expense of reopening all the marginal mines would probably be less than \$20 million against the cost of somewhere between \$500 mil-

lion and \$650 million for this program. In addition, we would be conserving there ores in the ground, instead of wasting them now when they are a glut on the market.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we should, in prudence, and in good conscience, relate this bill to our overall fiscal outlook.

The present estimates indicate a deficit for this year of between \$12 billion and \$15 billion.

We, certainly, cannot continue these peacetime deficits. If we continue these types of programs, we cannot avoid imposing substantial new taxes next year.

What taxes, are the gentlemen who vote for these expenditures, willing to impose next year?

Is this Congress willing to substantially increase corporation taxes?

Shall we increase excise taxes?

Shall we wipe out depletion allowances?

Shall we reduce the \$600 personal income tax exemption? If we were to wipe out all of the \$600 exemption, it is doubtful if that alone would be enough to cover the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that those who advocate these expenditures, also give this Congress and the taxpayers of this country, some estimate of the taxes that will have to be imposed in the next session of Congress.

The responsibility for voting and imposing taxes will rest, primarily, ethically, and politically, upon those gentlemen who continue to vote for these spending and squandering programs.

Mr. Chairman, most of us are opposed to planned socialism. This is the heart of the political-economic theory of the Soviet and Red China Governments.

There is one political-economic philosophy that is worse than planned socialism, it is the unplanned socialism exemplified in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the following letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation explains its views with respect to the pending legislation:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1958.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,

Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re Mineral subsidy bills, S. 4036 and H. R. 13280.

DEAR MR. ENGLE: This is to summarize the policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to the above specified bills. It will be appreciated if you will incorporate this letter in the record of the hearing on this subject.

We are very seriously concerned that the proposal for mineral subsidies will establish a precedent that could be broadly extended to other industries; and that its application to any industry would serve as a vehicle whereby private competitive enterprises would be converted into enterprises controlled, directed and dependent upon Government.

If we are to adopt the precedent that certain mineral industries, because they face import competition, should receive direct subsidy payments, this policy could be applied with equal logic to a great many other industries. Nor is there any reason to suppose that this approach would be limited to commodities subject to import competition.

If the use of direct payments to bring total returns up to specified levels is warranted in the case of the minerals specified, there is no reason why the same approach should not at some future time be adopted for other minerals—iron ore, coal, oil, sulfur, potash, phosphates, and other mineral products.

Nor is there any reason why this approach should not be used for other natural resource industries such as forest products, fisheries, or for agriculture.

And if this is a desirable policy there is no reason why it should not be extended to many manufactured products—to textiles, ceramics, automobiles or farm machinery.

The railroads are currently involved in a serious income situation. With comparable logic, direct payments might be made to railroads to bring average earnings to a specified level.

It is submitted as axiomatic—

1. That which the Government subsidizes it will come to control, eventually, if not immediately. In the long run "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

2. That the support of price or income creates the need for control of production.

Both of these axioms are carried into effect in S. 4036 and H. R. 13280. These bills provide that the Secretary may fix quarterly limitations on the total amounts of each product for which payments are to be made. The Secretary is further authorized to distribute the benefits of the program equitably among the producers.

This is an effective control of production at any time the margin between the stabilization price and the market price is significant.

Thus, the Secretary of the Interior would have the authority to allocate the right to produce among the producers of each metal; and the quota for each producer would tend to be frozen, thus preventing normal shifts in the pattern of production in response to economic and market factors.

Any industry for which direct payments are used as an income-supporting device is likely to become a net consumer rather than a net producer of Federal tax revenue, thus adding significantly to the tax burden on all other taxpayers.

For example, a study by the Department of Agriculture of the cost of a direct payment program for agriculture at 90 percent of parity reached the conclusion that the program would cost between seven and one-half and ten billion dollars a year.

It is a basic feature of our private competitive enterprise system that price serves as the balance wheel—to balance supply and demand, to guide production and consumption, to direct the flow of investment. The economists would say that the function of price is to allocate resources.

But when Government steps into the picture to prevent price from performing any or all of these functions, we are, in effect, substituting political management, and centralized control, and planning for the impersonal operation of the market system.

It is our conviction that the archstone of the economic system that has made America the arsenal and support of the Free World, is that its functioning is guided primarily by the impersonal operation of the market system, rather than upon centrally controlled and directed authority.

Individuals, by making choices based on price, vote many times daily as to their preferences. Thus free price, if not seriously altered, by interference of monopoly or Government, is the most democratic economic system ever devised.

We were fortunate in that circumstances freed us from the controls, the cartels, the guild system, the political management that was the old world economic system.

Many observers of the European scene have suggested that the post-war recovery of

Europe has been roughly proportionate to the extent to which it has thrown off the shackles of centralized control, whether by cartel or government, and moved toward the market system.

The extraordinary resurgence of the German economy since World War II is attributed to the wartime destruction of the many institutional arrangements to restrict competition and control price and production, and the steadfast opposition of the political leadership of the German Government to the reinstatement of such institutional arrangements.

It is our view, therefore, that the issues involved are far broader than the specific mineral industry problems covered by the bills. The basic issue involved is the choice between (1) a free competitive private enterprise system operating in response to market factors or (2) central planning and direction of the economy by government. The pragmatic test of experience, in our view, evidences the overwhelming superiority of the first choice. We believe it is important to the long-run welfare of the people of the United States and to the strength of our economic system that we avoid on every possible occasion, any excursions or precedents going in the direction of the second choice.

The implications of this proposal in terms of foreign trade and foreign relations will also be obvious. The net effect of a payment program is to reduce imports below what they would otherwise be by subsidizing higher cost production here at home. We believe that the long-run welfare of the whole American economy will be most furthered by policies that result in a high level rather than a low level of trade between nations. We must import if we are to export. The present imbalance between exports and imports is not desirable, either to the United States or to other countries. Barriers to increased imports stand in the way of obtaining a better balance.

National defense is commonly given as the reason for measures to protect a domestic industry. Present legislation provides means whereby such factor may be given carefully considered attention. But this national defense aspect can be overdone. If mineral imports come from nearby countries such as Canada, Mexico, etc., this provides essentially the same national-defense feature as production in the United States.

The proposed method of financing mineral subsidies contained in S. 4036 and H. R. 13280, avoids annual review of such expenditures by the Appropriations Committees and the Congress and adds one more noncontrolled expenditure item to the Federal budget.

It is not our purpose to present a comprehensive or alternative program for the minerals industry. This is the appropriate function of the voluntary associations representing the industry. Our only purpose is to set forth, in general terms, why the American Farm Bureau Federation believes the enactment of mineral subsidy legislation is not a desirable alternative; but, on the contrary, is against public policy for the reasons stated above.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I urge passage of S. 4036 as it has been reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In my opinion it provides the minimal requirements for the survival of our domestic mining industry.

Testimony has already been presented to the House concerning many features of this legislation. I wish only to add to this excellent presentation a few brief comments concerning the importance of S. 4036 for the Nation's chrome miners.

Mr. Speaker, section 402 of the legislation now before the House provides a cautious and limited approach to the problem besetting the small domestic producer of chromium ore. No one examining this proposed program could contend that overgenerous consideration is being asked for our hard-pressed miners. The bill calls for an incentive payment of \$35 per long dry ton for domestically produced ore. The program is drafted so as to provide maximum benefits to the small chrome producer by placing a 10,000 long-dry-ton limitation on any single mining operation. Thus, assistance is given to the type of chrome miner who characterizes the chrome-producing industry.

We have been told that S. 4036 is nothing more than subsidy legislation for the American miner. Certainly this is one aspect of this legislation. It does provide a subsidy in the form of an incentive payment for the small miner. But I can think of few more worthy recipients of a Government payment than those individuals who are attempting to develop an essential domestic industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a firm supporter of reciprocal-trade agreements. I enthusiastically supported the recent extension of that act for an additional period of time. But if it is necessary to break down tariff walls, then it is equally necessary to guarantee an essential domestic industry sufficient Government support so as to enable it to develop and expand. That is exactly what S. 4036 would do by providing incentive payments to assist our domestic mining industry to return to the thriving condition where it can effectively compete with foreign producers.

Mr. Speaker, defeat of S. 4036 means the defeat of the small independent miner who is the backbone of the chrome-producing industry. Rejection of this legislation means that the United States would become 100 percent dependent on foreign producers of chromium ore. I submit that the American miner and the American people are deserving of more constructive action.

S. 4036 offers us an opportunity to reactivate our presently dormant mining operation. It offers a sound, cautious approach which I believe is worthy of our support.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because I feel we must keep the lead- and zinc-mining industry of the United States in a healthy and vigorous condition—as sound public policy. The overwhelming endorsement given by the Senate and by the House

Interior Committee to the substance of the bill as evidencing a keen desire to aid the ailing lead and zinc mines is most gratifying.

Mining, smelting, and refining of lead and zinc is indispensable to the commerce of our Nation. We cannot expect these important extractive industries to survive if they must exist under free trade while being taxed to help provide subsidies for other areas of our economy, that is, farming, shipbuilding, plane travel, and so forth.

It is to the everlasting credit of the lead and zinc miners that they have faithfully followed the road open to them by law in seeking tariff relief twice in the last 5 years—but to no avail. Each time they received the unanimous recommendation of the Tariff Commission that relief is necessary only to be met with alternate measures such as stockpiling, or futile appeals to foreign countries to let up on the flood of metal shipped to the United States.

We know that the industry would prefer to receive assistance through a tariff rather than to be subsidized, but it has no longer any choice in the matter. The administration has proposed another alternate solution, a subsidy arrangement, which is embodied in the bill (S. 4036) before us. I do not think the bill goes far enough, but at this late hour in the session, and considering the urgency of the matter, it is the best we can hope for. It is either this bill or more hardship. Certainly, if we have millions to spend to develop industries abroad, bolstering their competitive position, we should have equal solicitude for our domestic industry.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill so that wage earners who are now without work may soon be returned to their jobs in the lead and zinc mines and smelters of our Nation.

SUMMARY—LEAD-ZINC

I. Experience of lead-zinc industry under various provisions of United States trade laws and legislative proposals:

1. May 10, 1950, lead industry petitioned for "escape clause" pursuant to Mexican Trade Agreement and Executive Order 9832. Denied by Tariff Commission July 18, 1950, formally dismissed by Commission January 25, 1951. Reason given was that United States had canceled Mexican agreement effective December 31, 1950. Duty on lead temporarily returned to 1930 rate.

2. Early 1951 lead-zinc industry advised Committee on Reciprocity Information against cuts in duty at forthcoming Torquay meeting. Despite this, duty on both lead and zinc was cut at Torquay, effective June 6, 1951. Lead duty had only been restored 5 months before by United States abrogation of Mexican agreement.

3. Industry petitioned the Tariff Commission on February 14, 1951, for a section 336 "difference in cost of production" investigation. Denied by Commission on May 29, 1951. Reason given was that trade agreement rates could not be changed by section 336 action.

4. Lead-zinc industry petitioned the Commission on September 14, 1953, for "escape clause" action under section 7 of Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. On May 21, 1954, the Commission unanimously found serious injury and recommended maximum increase in duties.

5. Concurrent with the 1953-1954 "escape clause" investigation the Commission con-

ducted a section 332 "general investigation" and on April 19, 1954, forwarded its 356-page report to the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Finance.

6. On August 20, 1954, the President declined to implement the recommendations of the Commission and instead initiated defense stockpile purchases and barter acquisitions.

7. Nearly a year ago (May 28, 1957) the Department of Agriculture, by a series of regulations, stopped barter, the major alternate program instituted by the President. August 1, 1957, Office of Defense Mobilization announced defense stockpile goals were nearly met. ODM ceased zinc purchases in April 1958 and has announced lead purchases will cease in June 1958.

8. ODM has stated that due to very large Government stocks of lead and zinc (over 1,250,000 tons of each metal), the industry is not eligible for consideration pursuant to the national security amendment (section 7 (b)) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

9. On June 19, 1957 the administration forwarded to the Congress a bill suspending present duties on lead and zinc and substituting a series of import taxes to be effective only if the United States price of lead was below 17 cents and zinc below 14½ cents.

10. Hearings were held on the administration's bill August 1 and 2 (House) and July 22-24, 1957 (Senate). Industry concurred in "peril point" prices of 17 cents and 14½ cents, but said schedule of import taxes inadequate. On the average, proposed schedule was about 25 percent less than 1954 recommendation by Tariff Commission which the President said was insufficient.

11. Following the exchange of letters in August 1957 between the late Mr. Cooper and the President, the industry again petitioned the Tariff Commission for escape clause action. Petition filed 6 months ago (Sept. 27, 1957); hearing before Commission 4½ months ago (Nov. 19-26, 1957).

12. In his letter of August 20, 1954 the President stated maximum increase duties would have only a minor effect on United States lead-zinc prices and would not reopen United States mines. The industry's pending petition requests quotas and increased duties. A complete plan for quotas was submitted to the Commission.

13. Rather than quotas or a combination of tariff and quotas, the industry believes a fair and effective answer would be provided by legislation suspending the present duties and in lieu thereof establishing peril point market prices, 17 cents for lead, 14½ cents for zinc, with a 4 cent import tax immediately behind these peril point prices. Tax would be payable by importers only if they imported unneeded amounts of lead or zinc and would break the United States market price below these peril point prices.

14. Such legislation would increase the flow of trade dollars since exporting countries could supply United States needs at much better prices than they are receiving today. While the quantity of import lead and zinc would be less, the prices for needed imports would be greater and would more than offset any decline in volume. This would serve to provide importing countries needed additional dollars with which to purchase other United States commodities and manufacturing products.

II. Comments on lead-zinc statistics:

1. For 10 years United States industrial consumption of lead and zinc have been fairly constant at about 1,100,000 tons per year. During this same period the ratio of lead imports to United States mine production has grown from 58 percent to 150 percent; in the case of zinc increased from 40 percent to 124 percent.

2. During this 10 year period imports of lead have increased from 220,000 tons a year

to 500,000 tons a year; zinc imports from 280,000 tons a year to 730,000 tons a year. United States mine production has stayed fairly constant during periods of reasonable prices but has now been curtailed more than 30 percent.

3. The statistics attached herewith are based on net imports for consumption which are those used by the Tariff Commission. Statistics are also compiled on the basis of general imports (which include material entering bonded warehouses). Estimates for 1957 would show general imports for zinc exceeded 800,000 tons and lead exceeded 580,000 tons.

4. Varying United States market prices during the last 10 years have had very minor, if any, effect on United States industrial consumption of lead and zinc.

5. Unneeded imports caused United States supply of lead and zinc to greatly exceed industrial requirements. Before barter stopped, almost a year ago, large amounts of these excess imports were absorbed by governmental acquisitions.

6. Unneeded imports have forced the price of lead to decline from 16 cents in early 1957 to 12 cents—a drop of 25 percent. Zinc has been forced down from 13½ cents to 10 cents—a decline of 26 percent.

7. The sharp decline in United States mine production has occurred in the second half of 1957 and early 1958. Present annual rate is lower than the depression years of the mid-1930's.

8. Employment in the lead-zinc mining industry has been cut in half. In the 1954 escape-clause action the Tariff Commission found employment had declined by 9,000 jobs. In the current situation over 5,000 additional employees have lost their jobs in the industry. Total loss of over 13,000 jobs.

9. While United States prices improved in 1955 and 1956 under the alternative programs initiated by the President (in lieu of accepting the Commission's recommendations), employment did not return to the early 1952 level.

10. During Korea United States prices of lead and zinc were frozen by the Government. Import duties were suspended subject to reinstatement if the United States price would fall below 18 cents for each metal.

11. During 1957, in contrast to curtailment of United States mine production, imports of lead and zinc were exceedingly high—in the case of zinc reached all-time record levels.

12. While United States mine production has been curtailed 30 percent, foreign mine production has not declined substantially. Noteworthy during the severe price break of 1953-54 (the time of the prior Tariff Commission's recommendations) mine production, outside the United States, did not decline and, in fact, increased despite low prices.

13. Stocks of refined unsold lead and zinc at domestic plants are over 400,000 tons.

14. Calculations show that the 4 major exporting countries (Canada, Mexico, Peru, Australia) are actually losing dollar exchange revenue by flooding United States market with unneeded metal.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, although I have decided not to oppose the so-called Euratom legislation (S. 4273), I have grave doubts as to the timeliness or the wisdom of the President's proposal.

The legislative draft which was sent to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was completely unacceptable to me and many other members of the committee. We have carefully analyzed its original language and have rewritten the bill.

The original language would have provided for a blank check of authority and authorization of funds. The authority would have allowed the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate, without Congressional check, the types of reactors and the terms and conditions under which approval would have been given to each separate contract between a United States manufacturer and foreign purchaser.

Under the new and present legislative language and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy report, safeguards and mutually agreed upon purposes and intents have been more carefully delineated. The Joint Committee has retained its right to scrutinize and effectively exert its judgment through separate consideration of each project and separate authorization of funds and guarantees for each international arrangement. The Joint Committee has plainly leg- certain criteria for the Atomic Energy Commission to use in the negotiations of projects.

The joint committee has plainly legislated protection from third party liability to the United States Government and expects the Atomic Energy Commission to obtain, in each contract, sufficient disclaimers and indemnity protections to hold the Government free from damage claims in the third party liability area.

The report provides clear and concise language as to Congressional intent and is to be considered meticulously in the future action of the Atomic Energy Commission and its future interpretation of the Joint Committee's intents and purposes.

Because of these changes in the legislative draft, the understandings which have been agreed upon between the Joint Committee and the Commission, and the retention of the funding and assistance authority in the Congress, I shall not oppose the legislation.

One other factor which I have considered in my decision has been the international effect of defeating this legislation. The President, following the advice of his special atomic adviser, Mr. Strauss, has made certain public statements, offers and commitments to friendly nations for assistance in the application of atomic energy. I consider some of these Presidential actions to be ill advised and the Euratom program premature. I will give some of the reasons for my statement.

The goal of economic atomic electrical power has not, as yet, been attained. Nor will it be attained even in the high cost areas of Europe by the technology to be built into the Euratom reactor program.

The necessity to build more than one reactor of a limited choice of types will involve costly duplication. It will also preclude the advantage of including "stairstep" advances in the next few years' technology as far as these six large reactors are concerned.

Some of this objection may be overcome if the Atomic Energy Commission will insist on convertible or adaptable features being built into each reactor

so that future improvements may be incorporated at a later date. Further protection may be obtained by delaying for 2 years at least 2 of the 6 reactors.

As I estimate the potential liability in terms of American taxpayers' dollars, this program could involve—in grants, loans, and furnished-free inventories—well over a half billion dollars. If all goes well and the Euratom nations are willing and able to repay the loans and other obligations, this outlay may be considerably reduced over a period of 20 years.

I fear that the general poor financial position of these nations will jeopardize repayment and I also fear that disillusionment over the economics of nuclear power may well cause resentment toward their benefactors.

I fear that the Euratom program will be used as an excuse for not proceeding with a vigorous domestic program. Although the Atomic Energy Commission has testified before the Joint Committee that the Euratom program will not constitute grounds for nullifying a vigorous, Government-sponsored program in the future, I predict that such an excuse will be advanced. The Joint Committee will not accept such an excuse, in my opinion.

It is interesting to note that the Gore-Holifield bill, which sought to build at Government expense several large and intermediate types of advanced reactors, was opposed and defeated by the administration under Chairman Strauss' leadership. Mr. Strauss claimed, during that debate, that the way to advance reactor technology was through small laboratory models of reactors of many types and that we should not be concerned with a race for kilowatts.

Because of the Strauss philosophy, Great Britain built large power producing reactors and achieved a dominant competitive position in the international market. We now find ourselves in the position of advocating the opposite course of the Strauss philosophy of building laboratory size reactors.

We find the administration advocating the building of a limited and necessarily duplicating type and series of large power producing reactors in foreign countries with United States subsidies.

We find ourselves 2 or 3 years late in the atomic power program and we are hypothecating United States dollars in larger amounts of potential liability than called for under the Gore-Holifield bill.

Under the Euratom program, it is probable that at least one-half of the 6 reactors will be built in all or part public power nations. We therefore find that the former cry of socialism in regard to building Government-financed reactors on Government-owned atomic energy plant sites, which was for sole use in the said plants, has now been conveniently forgotten.

In sponsoring the Euratom program that which was socialism in the TVA becomes acceptable on the Euphrates. The complete hypocrisy and inconsistency of the Eisenhower-Strauss atomic philosophy was never exposed more clearly.

We now plan to support large-scale power-reactor programs in France, where all electric utilities are nationally owned, and in Italy, which is about evenly divided between public- and private-power interests.

What are the basic reasons behind the administration's support of Euratom?

First. It is a belated attempt to implement the President's atoms-for-peace message of 1953, 5 years ago.

Second. It is also a belated attempt to cover up the failure of the Strauss atomic power development program, which was based on a claim that private enterprise would furnish the research, development, and construction money for large-scale atomic power reactors. This program has failed. Private industry has not and cannot absorb the cost of attaining the goal of economic atomic power. Private industry has admitted this inability before our Joint Committee many times in the last 2 years.

Third. Rather than admit that the administration's atomic-power-development program has miserably failed and that today we cannot compete with British-developed large power reactors in the world market, the administration has come forward with a complicated mixture of half-baked international commitments, direct and indirect subsidies for American atomic-machinery manufacturers, and starry-eyed European reactor buyers. This is for the purpose of covering up the failure of the Strauss atomic-power-development program.

What are some of these direct and indirect subsidies in the Euratom program?

First. We are only asked to authorize \$90 million to subsidize reactor fuel manufacturers in the two fields of fuel element manufacture and fuel element life.

Second. We are asked to authorize approximately \$400 million of fuel inventory for the six Euratom reactors. The terms are theoretically based on a 20-year lease sale contract. The first 10 years provide for 4½ percent interest payments on the appraised value of the fuel. The second 10 years provide for interest at the same rate plus amortization of the principal over the second 10-year period.

Third. The Export-Import Bank is supposed to furnish the Euratom buyers \$135 million on a low interest rate loan. The factor of collateral and recovery in the event of default has not yet been solved and seems to be most difficult.

Fourth. We are committed to purchase plutonium which is produced in the six Euratom reactors at a total estimated cost of \$49,200,000. We are restricted in the use of this plutonium to peacetime purposes only. At the present time there has not been developed a peacetime use for plutonium. This investment, therefore, is predicated upon the hope that we will be successful in developing nonweapon, peacetime uses for plutonium.

Fifth. We are to be obligated to process the spent fuel elements at prices which we hope will cover the cost involved in the processing. But, in this field there are unknown factors such as

the cost of permanent disposal of waste products. It is possible that this will cause us great trouble and expense as the burden of disposal of the atomic wastes becomes greater.

Sixth. We are to be obligated to furnish up to a maximum of \$50 million for joint research and development in the restricted field which applies to the types of reactors selected for the Euratom program. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will watch this phase of the program very carefully to see that equal funds are supplied for this joint program by the Euratom nations and also to see that the American people receive the benefits of such research and development as may occur under this tax supported program.

Seventh. By no means the least problem which is involved in the building of plutonium producing reactors in foreign countries, is that of enlarged production and processing of atomic and hydrogen weapon material, that is, plutonium. If we buy the plutonium for peacetime use, we may not be able to use it. On the other hand, if the owning nations refuse to sell the plutonium to us, it becomes their own ready supply for the development of their atomic hydrogen weapons program.

At this time when the peace of the world depends upon an international agreement against using nuclear weapons, we are embarking upon a foreign program of building plutonium producing reactors which may provide the basic material for many other nations to have their own independent supply of plutonium. Had we used the tax moneys to support a domestic program of reactor building, we would have control over the plutonium and this danger would not be created by our encouragement of a foreign reactor building program, over which we can have no sure control.

Eighth. This Euratom program may be used to further obstruct and delay an aggressive stairstep program of reactor development in the United States. Such a reactor development program would not be contingent upon uncertain or unknown international factors, but would be completely within our own control. It could take into consideration only the primary object of building a series of large scale power producing reactors over the years with enough time between each step to take advantage of technical advancement. If the Euratom program is allowed to nullify such a domestic program, then we may awaken too late to insure American leadership in the atomic power field.

Ninth. The claim put forward by the more enthusiastic proponents of the original Euratom sponsors, that this program would solve the dependence of the European countries on Middle East oil is of course unrealistic. The 6 countries comprising the Euratom group have an installed kilowatt capacity of some 60 million units. The pending atomic-power program of this group will amount to 1 million or one-sixtieth of the total capacity. Furthermore it will be more costly than conventional power-plants. We may therefore reasonably

conclude that no appreciable effect will be made on solving the problem of European dependence on Middle East oil within the lifetime of these reactors.

It is for these and other reasons that I am gravely troubled with this Euratom legislation. A great deal will depend upon the diligence of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in scrutinizing each and every step of the program which may be proposed. A great deal will depend upon the development in the domestic field of a reactor-building program which will go far beyond the Euratom program in the field of realizing our own technical capacity.

It is only because I believe that the Joint Committee will discharge its duties conscientiously and diligently in the years that lie ahead that I am constrained—although reluctantly, to allow the administration's program to be initiated.

As one member of the Joint Committee, I serve warning at this time upon all concerned that I shall look at each proposed international project with a magnifying glass. And, I will demand that wherever possible the rights of and potential benefits to American taxpayers be preserved.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill S. 4036, to provide relief for the domestic mining industry. During debate on this issue the bill has been variously referred to as a rescue bill, a survival bill, a relief bill. It is all of that, and more, too. It is imperative that this legislation be enacted if our domestic production of the important minerals concerned with in this bill is to continue to exist. If we stand idly by and permit the mining industry to perish we will live to regret it, for these minerals are imperative in time of national emergency. We cannot turn their production on and off as one would a water faucet. In order to guarantee continued production we must act favorably on this legislation.

As an example, I will cite the case of tungsten, the metal with which I am most interested, as several tungsten mines are located in the district which I have the privilege to represent. Two years ago more than 200 tungsten mines were in operation in the United States. Today exactly one is operating. Two years ago some 4,000 persons were employed in tungsten mining activity. Now this number has dwindled to a mere handful. Tungsten is vitally necessary for our war machines in time of emergency. Yet, in World War II we were compelled to import much of that which we used. To stockpile this precious commodity toward the time when we will need it is a reasonable and practical practice.

Incentive payments such as are proposed here are not new. Subsidies exist for many segments of our economy deemed vital to national defense. Some do not approach the justification involved in metals such as tungsten, lead, zinc, copper, and fluorspar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a favorable vote on S. 4036 in the interests of the welfare of our great country.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, it has been charged that the copper companies have such huge earnings that they do not need this legislation for them to survive. I do not know about the rest of the copper mining companies but I want to read an excerpt from the Fortune article that I inserted in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day.

Anaconda sales in 1957 dropped to \$571 million from \$749 million in 1956, and profits to \$44 million from \$111,500,000 in 1956. In the first quarter of this year income was \$19,895,055 (versus \$44,310,960 in 1957; profits, \$6,130,898 (versus \$18,156,320 in 1957)).

Meanwhile Anaconda is riding out the storm, which is far less severe than many others Anaconda has weathered in its 63-year history.

But the storm is still raging and in the Washington Post on August 15 there was a story on the financial page relating that the Anaconda Co.'s consolidated net income in the first half of 1958 fell 62 percent. And mind you that is consolidated net income and includes income from the Anaconda Co.'s other operations such as the aluminum plant and their lumber operations and includes income from foreign mines as well as domestic.

By closing mines the mining companies can weather the storm, by drawing on other resources perhaps the companies can weather the storm. But the miners who are unemployed have no other resources and they cannot close down their homes and discharge their families. Many weeks last winter Montana had the dubious honor of leading the Nation in the rate of unemployment. Now our rate has fallen off, many people have exhausted their benefits, and have gone from unemployment compensation to general welfare. The following table shows what has happened in Silver Bow County, the county in Montana in which the copper mines are located:

Moneys dispensed by the Silver Bow County Welfare Board from what is known as the counties emergency general assistance program.

	Money paid
1957—January.....	\$3,139
February.....	2,607
March.....	2,546
April.....	2,633
May.....	2,143
June.....	2,045
July.....	2,603
August.....	2,628
September.....	3,756
October.....	4,559
November.....	6,265
December.....	7,604
Total.....	42,528
1958—January.....	12,122
February.....	20,834
March.....	34,532
April.....	36,305
May.....	32,517
June.....	33,566
July.....	33,193

¹ These figures represent dollars amounts only.

But more serious for you and for your constituents in every section of the country is the fact that in order to stay afloat the mines have been closed. These mines in Butte, Mont., are some of

the deepest in the country. You have been told how properties deteriorate when they are closed, how they flood, how the timbers rot and the shafts move and the machinery rusts. Sometimes the cost of reopening is prohibitive and a great and valuable natural resource is lost forever. And that is where your own self-interest comes in, and the interest in the security of your country and your interest in continuing to have the raw materials to maintain the American standard of living.

Prior to World War II, the United States produced more copper than it consumed. But the increased wartime demand for copper so increased our consumption that in 1942 it became the most critical metal of all. Today the United States in peacetime produces about 42 percent of the copper produced in the Free World but in a peacetime economy it consumes 51 percent of the Free World's supply, so that while the United States is the largest copper-producing country in the world, it is also the greatest copper-consuming country in the world. Nearly half of the copper consumed in America is used in pure metallic form by the electrical industry in the manufacture of generators, motors, telephone and telegraph equipment, powerlines and similar items. Building and building equipment takes 10 percent and the automotive industry another 10 percent. The remainder is used in bronze and brass alloys and for such things as refrigerators, air conditioning equipment and the like.

In time of war, copper's chief use is in munitions but it is also used in airplane and missile production, signal equipment and ordnance.

Copper is the most nearly indispensable metal in war and peace to maintain the defense of the Nation and to maintain the American standard of living and production.

In 1950, the United States used 18 pounds per capita. Russia that year consumed but 2.43 pounds per capita. The disparity in copper consumption indicates a similar disparity in the standard of living in the two countries. In the same year, Canada used copper at the rate of 15½ pounds per capita; the United Kingdom, 14.84 pounds; and Germany, 9.97. As living standards and industrialization increase in other countries of the world, the foreign consumption increases. For example, European use of copper increased 21.4 percent in the period from 1955-57.

Our domestic consumption in 1956 was about 1½ million tons, our domestic production was slightly over a million tons. Our domestic production can continue at the rate of a million tons per year if we can maintain a healthy mining industry.

In 1956, the world production of copper was 3,750,000 tons. If the United Kingdom, Canada, France, and Germany had consumed copper in 1956 at the same per-capita rate as the United States more than 4 million tons of copper would have been required, or an annual shortage of 250,000 tons. If Russia begins to approach the American consumption level, we will need a 50-percent

greater world production of copper than we now have.

To demonstrate how the world demand is increasing, let us compare the imports and exports of copper in the years 1956 and 1957. In 1956, we imported 276,000 tons of blister copper. That is unrefined copper. This was refined into electrolytic copper in American refineries and 222,000 tons were exported. In 1957, we imported 301,000 tons of unrefined copper and exported 361,000 tons of electrolytic copper. In 1956 and 1957, we imported about the same amount, 590,000 tons, but in 1957 we exported 125,000 more tons than in the previous year. This as a result of the 21-percent increase in European consumption I mentioned.

If this rate of increase continues we shall be glad we purchased this 150,000 tons. If we are to be able to maintain our armaments and our domestic standard of living, we must maintain our copper industry at the present level. If we keep our mines open and our skilled miners employed, in a few years we will be grateful that we have them to provide a domestic supply of a very scarce metal. The stockpile we have accumulated, and the amount we add if we purchase every pound of the 150,000 tons authorized by this bill will be worth a great deal more to us to keep our electrical and our automotive industries supplied with indispensable metal for both our peacetime and our wartime economy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the discussion on the mineral bill before us some Members have wondered why we must maintain our domestic tungsten mining industry and have alluded to certain stockpile data which are classified information and hence not subject to critical evaluation and debate in an open forum. However well intentioned these Members may be, I fear that they are overlooking both the critical position with respect to tungsten in which the Nation found itself only a few years ago; and, more importantly, I think they are also overlooking the very great importance that the high temperature resistant metals, of which tungsten is in first place, will be called upon to play in the future defense of the Nation.

I should like to remind my colleagues that in mid-1951, just 7 short years ago, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate singled out tungsten as one of the most critical materials where shortages were imperiling our defense effort. The 27th report of his Preparedness Subcommittee, dated July 5, 1951, revealed the critical shortage of tungsten and pointed out that our high velocity armor-piercing shell program was jeopardized by inadequate supplies. That report was issued at a time when our Armed Forces had been pushed back in Korea and when the main world sources of tungsten were in extremely vulnerable foreign countries including even the enemy itself, since China had been a major source. Despite our then monopoly in the field of atomic weapons, American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines were slugging it out on the ground with the enemy, and the preponderance of our casualties were in the

ground forces. Expanded tank war in Korea or elsewhere on the periphery of the Free World could have pushed us back farther. Tungsten carbide high-velocity armor-piercing shells were needed in great quantity. Accordingly, where we had previously neglected our domestic resources, the Government instituted a major domestic purchase program to try to get domestic mines into operation. Further, following the recommendations of the Preparedness Subcommittee, a large foreign procurement program was also launched by the Government. And in those days of desperate shortage from time to time stockpile specifications were waived in one respect or another to permit the Government to take title to material that would not otherwise have met the very rigid specifications of the strategic stockpile. This too was in furtherance of the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee.

In the early years of the Korean war tungsten was under domestic allocation and price controls and conservation and limitation orders were in effect to limit uses. Even our critical jet engine programs were held back by quantitative limitations on the amount of tungsten that could be employed. Indeed, the shortage was so desperate that tungsten was one of the few materials that were allocated throughout the Free World by the International Materials Conference. Under the stimulus of the domestic expansion program and desiring to see the national needs fulfilled, the domestic tungsten mining industry rose to the occasion and as the years passed proved that it had the ability to deliver the goods; in fact, by 1956 domestic production exceeded domestic consumption—a consumption that undoubtedly was smaller than normally would have existed had it not been for the extreme conservation measures in force on all industry during the Korean war. We should be eternally grateful that our stocks of tungsten in the strategic stockpile, in the Defense Production Act inventory, and the Public Law 733 inventory, are now in better shape than they were in the desperate days following the Communist attack in Korea. But merely because we currently appear to be in a somewhat more comfortable position in tungsten, and although the bill before us will add nothing to our tungsten stockpile, is this any cause for complacency with respect to keeping intact a source of our future supplies? I for one say "No."

The repeated failures under even ideal conditions of our missiles convince me that we have only begun to realize our need for much better high temperature resistant materials in engines and skins of missiles. Indeed, in its most recent annual report the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—which is now to become the nucleus of our new space agency—pointed out the critical need for development of protective coatings on metals such as tungsten that have a very high melting point and other favorable properties at elevated temperatures—43d Annual Report of the NACA, January 27, 1958.

Further, the distinguished Special Stockpile Advisory Committee, whose

members include Admiral Radford, General Smith, and others of like stature, pointed out in its report to ODM that demand for high temperature materials could increase sharply when research and development currently under way proves out. Each day we read in the public press of the priority being given to harnessing the superhigh temperatures of nuclear fission and fusion. Surely the efficient conversion of extremes of temperature to energy in a form useful to man will hinge on the improvement and greatly expanded use of high-temperature-resistant materials. Tungsten, with its melting point of 6,143 degrees Fahrenheit, possesses the highest melting point of all metals, and indeed of all elements known to man save one, carbon—which latter has a melting point of 6,692 degrees Fahrenheit. Consequently, greatly expanded uses no doubt will be demanded of us in the next few years. With the rest of the world sources of tungsten in highly vulnerable overseas areas, we cannot afford to let our domestic mining industry die. In the face of expanded future requirements, our stockpiles could represent but a small percentage of such new requirements. And further, we do not dare draw down our strategic stockpiles in any period short of all-out war. If tungsten was needed so desperately for anti-tank warfare in the Korean war, who is to say for sure that some new peripheral or limited war, which most authorities now concede to be more likely than all-out nuclear war, will not again result in a similar great demand? In 1951 Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's subcommittee pointed out that the Defense Department itself had completely failed to foresee its own requirements for tungsten for ammunition. How can we be sure that the secret data that most of us have had no opportunity to examine critically is any more accurate today?

In conclusion, therefore, I believe that in a period of world unrest such as the present, when our Nation is threatened as never before, we must take this step currently before us to assure the continuity of a nucleus of our domestic tungsten mining operations. Today the domestic tungsten mining industry is in the position of a drowning man, with all but one mine shut down. The legislation before us can be a lifesaver. To protect our national security and our economy, I, for one, believe the enactment of this legislation is essential.

On August 11, 1957, former President Herbert Hoover addressed a letter to the gentleman from New York, Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO, enclosing a copy of a letter which Mr. Hoover on May 23, 1957, wrote to Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce. The letter reads as follows:

THE WALDORF ASTORIA TOWERS,
New York, N. Y., May 23, 1957.

THE HONORABLE SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is just a personal suggestion which may wash out on investigation.

This country has been genuinely devoted to systematic conservation of national resources for over 50 years. The purpose is to

provide fundamental materials for our people 50 years hence. Many of these Federal agencies for this purpose are in your department.

My suggestion is that your Department canvass the prospective resources of the United States in the nonferrous metals. In my view, there have been no consequential new districts discovered in the past 50 years; the ground has been well combed over and there is little prospect of consequential new districts being discovered; a good many districts have already been largely exhausted and those still producing are not likely to be in action 50 years hence.

All of which brings me to the possibility of trading the perishable surplus of food, costing huge amounts for storage, for an imperishable metal. The Department of Agriculture seems in difficulty with this policy as they are not in the metal conservation field.

The problems need a look at from this point of view.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

I call attention to former President Hoover's letter to Secretary Weeks in the hope that you might be impressed with the views expressed by this distinguished American who has served our Government in many capacities. I am certain you will recall that at one time Mr. Hoover was our Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hoover is also a distinguished engineer and understands and appreciates the importance of providing fundamental materials for the people of our Nation and having such materials available in adequate quantities to enable us to meet all of the emergencies and eventualities of the future. It will be noted that Mr. Hoover emphasized the importance of our barter program under the provisions of Public Law 480, under which program we have been trading perishable surplus agricultural commodities for imperishable metals which are in short supply in our own country. Mr. Hoover indicates in this letter that officials of the Department of Agriculture seem to be in difficulty in administering this barter program and that they are in difficulty because "they are not in the metal conservation field."

Mr. Chairman, the only living former Republican President and the present Republican President seem to agree that we need to stockpile great quantities of strategic and fundamental materials. President Eisenhower, I understand, approves and recommends the bill under consideration and former President Hoover seems to be in accord with the views expressed by President Eisenhower.

In conclusion, I want to again emphasize the importance of the pending measure to hundreds of my constituents who have been deprived of their livelihoods because of the closing of the largest tungsten mining operation in the country. If this bill is passed and becomes law, the tungsten mine in my District will open and will operate and the miners now unemployed will return to their jobs and continue to produce this precious metal which is so essential to the well-being of the people of this generation and to generations yet unborn. The problems here involved are of paramount importance. I commend this bill and urge you to approve its provisions.

CIV—1183

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA].

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this legislation because I feel it will implement and nurture a healthy economy throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, S. 4036, under consideration is of vital importance in the promotion of our domestic economy and securing the defense needs of our country for the future. While this statement may be too general, I would like to project the possible results that underlie the enactment of this legislation. It is patently clear to all of us here that the domestic mining industry has been suffering too many setbacks lately because of foreign competition. The ailing mining industry of our country cannot survive unless it is placed on an equal competitive plane with foreign competitors. The "wait and see" attitude certainly demonstrates the verity of this statement because during this period we have finally realized the dire consequences resulting from this unfair position in which foreign imports have placed our domestic mining industry. During this session of Congress, we have been talking about recession, relief of unemployment, and foreign aid. We have helped foreign countries in the name of peace in terms of billions of dollars. We have shared our wealth with peoples in foreign lands in the hope of raising their standard of living and making it possible for these unfortunate people to share in a better way of life. Our American hearts have responded bountifully without vociferous protestations.

But now that the compass is directed at relieving a distressful domestic situation, we find loud protestations when we seek to help Americans within our borders and our country's economic future. I cannot perceive the logic of this position. I feel that we must continue to nurture the development of our natural resources for present and future use in peace or war, and at the same time provide a vehicle of subsistence for many of the mining families of this country and other families in related industries who are today facing economic strife because of the impact of foreign imports and the aforementioned competitive advantage. How can we say to these Americans that their plight must be resolved within the charity of their neighbors, when we, in turn, take the opposite position with respect to foreign peoples? I have repeatedly called to the attention of this body the sad situation which prevails in my State in its mining areas. Today I have received a very representative telegram which indicates clearly and most vividly the plight of many American families in one area of my State. I wish to quote this telegram at this point in the RECORD:

We urge passage of Senate bill 4036 for the following reasons: In our county of Grant we now have 1,700 unemployed miners who are completely out of work. Some of these men have been unemployed since May 1957. Reduction of men and shutting of mines has continued since May 1957 until

now. There is only one mining company operating in this mining district.

The following operations have shut down completely: United States Smelting Co., American Smelting & Refining Co., Peru Mining Co., Empire Zinc, Phelps-Dodge, Banner Mining Co. These men affected by lay-off have either exhausted their unemployment compensation or have been forced to leave this area. At this time 700 families in Grant County are now receiving surplus commodities through the welfare department; an emergency relief committee was formed which was composed of business, civic, labor, and fraternal organizations to try and help the distressed families, but this group has not been able to cope with the great problem created by unemployment. For these reasons we urge passage of S. 4036 so that these domestic mines can again reopen and workers can earn a living for themselves and families.

I know this situation is paralleled many times in other parts of our country. I do not believe that this Congress will forsake these people who need employment, or that we will close our eyes to the future of our country and paralyze the development of our resources which are so vital, not only in times of peace, but in times of defense need as well.

I sincerely urge that the House give favorable consideration to this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mrs. FOST].

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today represents our last chance to save the domestic lead-zinc industry. That may sound like a dramatic statement—but it is true.

Most of the Nation's 600 lead-zinc mines are now operating in the red. They are being kept open on a day-to-day basis—awaiting word of what happens in this Chamber. It is cheaper to operate them at a continuous loss than to close them down, because once a mine is closed it is very expensive—and sometimes almost impossible—to reopen.

These mines provide the major feed for the many smelting and refining plants which are scattered throughout the country adjacent to the mines. The smelters are also laying off men.

We all know that lead and zinc are essential to our peacetime industry and living. Should overseas supplies be diminished or cut off in a defense crisis, adequate domestic sources of lead and zinc would become crucial to our national survival. This vote, therefore, is in reality a national security vote.

To the people in a wide section of my State of Idaho the vote you are about to cast represents not just survival to them in some possible defense crisis in the future—but survival today. The largest lead-zinc producing area in the country is located in the Congressional District I represent. Shoshone County—the heart of the area—is a one-industry county, a lead-zinc county. The jobs of hundreds of miners and smelter workers and the economic stability of the mining companies are both immediately at stake.

But in a larger sense the security of a dozen thriving communities, and the thousands of people who live in them is in the balance. If this legislation is

not passed, their outlook is dark indeed. A number of small businesses have already failed—others would undoubtedly have to close their doors. Well-rooted families are already pulling up these roots and moving away. Others will follow. City fathers are worrying about diminishing tax revenues, and how they are going to meet commitments already made for city improvements. The people are desperate. Shoshone County, which in the past has produced so much wealth for America, faces the prospect of becoming a long valley of ghost towns.

Since we have surpluses of some of our minerals, you may feel we do not need to keep producing them at this time. It is true that we are in a valley of low consumption, but our long-range problems are more likely to be problems of shortages and rising prices. Normally, our domestic mines can supply only about 70 percent of our industrial consumption of lead and zinc. Research could greatly expand the use of these and other metals.

I need only to mention that a total of 65 minerals used by America in World War II came from abroad, and to say that for 27 of them there was no domestic source of supply whatsoever, to indicate how important it is to keep our domestic mines producing strategic ores so we will not get caught short in a defense emergency.

We had almost 2 years to prepare for World War II—we may not have that much time again. And, you will recall, great quantities of minerals went to the bottom of the ocean in the first few months of that war. Should there be a space age war—which God forbid—we might not even have 2 days to prepare for it.

As I said earlier, this bill represents a last resort for some of the domestic minerals industries covered by it—and particularly for the lead-zinc industry, which is probably in the deepest crisis.

No industry has fought harder to stay on its feet. It has written an unparalleled record of conscientiously pursuing every procedure available to obtain administrative relief from the importation of cheaply mined foreign ores. On three different occasions it has gone to the great trouble and expense of asking the Tariff Commission for relief under escape clause procedures. On two occasions the Commission has made a unanimous finding of serious injury, but no action has been taken to help the industry.

This is hard to understand, since excessive imports are so obviously the cause of the industry's trouble. As I have indicated, about 30 percent of our industrial consumption of lead and zinc must be supplied by imports. Today, however, 70 percent of this consumption is coming from imports.

Mr. Chairman, the lead-zinc mines have literally been kept in operation this past year on hope and promises. The miners and owners alike sweated out the long months while we were awaiting the report from the Tariff Commission on the industry's most recent attempt to secure relief through the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. They are still staggering from the blow they received

when the President decided that the escape clause route was not the correct approach, and suggested the subsidy bill now before us.

At that time only 1,700 men were employed underground in the lead-zinc mining industry in Idaho. Most of those men who had jobs underground were cut early this year to a 4-day week, which considerably cut their pay checks.

Early in June, the Bunker Hill Co., the largest lead-zinc operator in the area, whose workers underground are already on drastically reduced shifts, alerted its smelter workers to a possible shutdown during August and September if some relief was not provided by the Congress or the administration during June. On August 1, 200 men were laid off, and the entire underground operation is threatened with a complete shutdown. The Day Mines, another substantial operation, has laid off more employees, and expects to curtail all operations in the area around the 1st of September if this bill does not pass.

Needless to say, the people of the area have their ears glued to the radio for news on this bill.

The administration has suggested a stabilization price of 14.75 cents for lead and 12.75 cents for zinc. Many of our mines, which by no stretch of the imagination could be called marginal, could exist at the 14 and 12 cents margins only by liquidating their present ore assets. They could not finance exploration for new ore bodies. Other mines could only break even with the subsidy prices.

The committee has therefore recommended the prices inserted in the bill by the Senate—15½ cents for lead, and 13½ cents for zinc, with ceilings of 3.9 and 2.9 respectively. The Idaho industry can keep operating at these figures, and I understand industry in other sections of the country can, too.

There are annual limitations per producer, per quarter, on the amount of ore on which a subsidy may be paid, both for lead and zinc, and for other metals covered by the bill, which makes it passage particularly important to small and middle-sized operators.

Mr. Chairman, the mine companies and mine workers have not been able to get relief from cheaply mined foreign imports through any existing administrative channels or under any existing law. We turned them down in committee when the extension of the Trade Agreements Act was considered. We turned them down on the floor of this body when the Trade Agreements Act was up for a vote. You will remember the attempt was made to recommit that bill to have written into it provisions to give relief to injured domestic industries. That attempt failed.

The bill before us today, is not all we had hoped for—but it is a step in the right direction. And it is a step which is desperately needed. I hope it will pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, here in the closing days of August when we long since should have completed our business and been home, we are still dis-

covering or creating new crises of one type or another that we are told cannot wait 3 or 4 months to be taken care of.

Here again today we have before us a bill we are told we have no alternative but to pass or accept catastrophe. Since about all the technical phases of this bill were discussed yesterday and were also discussed during consideration of the rule, I would like to talk basics in the very brief time I have at my disposal. As far as stockpile figures are concerned, for example, I think we have enough conflict of figures presented yesterday and in the debate on the rule that we can choose any part of these statistics we want to justify our position in being for or against this bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am sorry; I have but 3 minutes, I cannot yield.

Mr. METCALF. If the gentleman will yield I will see that he gets an additional minute.

Mr. COLLIER. I am sorry; I refuse to yield.

It seems strange this should have come up in the last minutes of our session, but, coincidentally, it happens to be an election year.

Furthermore, to contend that there is no problem in the mining and production of lead, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten would admittedly be ridiculous, but I repeat what I said yesterday, that this bill does not offer any real solution to the problem as I understand it. The solution of this problem lies with the Tariff Commission as shown by the hearings before our committee. Important men in the mining industry themselves say this is not the proper solution but they take this as the best remedy that can be given at the moment.

I say also that this is an item of legislation where the cure is worse than the disease. I might just say before I drift any further away from the basics of the program, that it was just 2 weeks ago that the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished and astute chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, stood in the well of this House and admonished the Members of this body of the inflation we would get into by this deficit spending.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I find myself down here in the well again. My message today is to try to tell you again what I told you yesterday. Yesterday many Members came to the well of this House and spoke of their bleeding hearts. They said they were interested in a dying industry, that they did not want the industry to die. Do you remember those words yesterday?

I did a little research in the meantime to find what dividends had been paid in the last few years by this dying industry. What about Kennecott Copper in the year 1953, what did it pay?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, knowing the gentleman from Ohio as I do, when he takes the floor he has in-

formation of importance to give us that all the Members should hear.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 185]

Anderson,	Gordon	Pilcher
Mont,	Grant	Powell
Ashley	Gwinn	Preston
Baker	Hale	Prouty
Barden	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Baumhart	Hibert	Rains
Beamer	Henderson	Rivers
Bentley	Hillings	St. George
Boykin	Hoffman	Scott, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Hollfield	Sheehan
Brownson	Hosmer	Shuford
Buckley	Hyde	Sieminski
Burdick	James	Smith, Kans.
Christopher	Jenkins	Smith, Miss.
Clark	Jensen	Spence
Clevenger	Jones, Mo.	Steed
Coffin	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	Kilburn	Teller
Cooley	LeCompte	Thomas
Coudert	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Denton	McCormack	Utt
Dies	McCulloch	Vanik
Dingell	McIntire	Wainwright
Doyle	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Eberhart	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Elliott	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Minshall	Winstead
Frelinghuysen	Morrison	Young
Friedel	Passman	

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVNS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 342 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this news item that I have just taken from the teletype out here in the Speaker's lobby. Here is what it says:

NEW YORK.—The stock market made another moderate advance today in quiet trading.

Pivotal stocks rose from fractions to about a point. Some gains went beyond that. Many stocks showed slight changes to the plus or minus side.

Features were Kennecott's rise of 1½ as hope waxed for congressional passage of the minerals-subsidy program; and Lorillard's drop of 2½ despite an upped dividend as traders sold on the news.

That just came over the ticker here. The people in the stock market in New York and throughout the Nation realize that this is a great gravy train that they are trying to get aboard now. It is one of the best ever in America, and if they can only get on it, everything will be fine. Yesterday it was hard to sit in this Chamber and listen to the people telling about this dying industry, the cop-

per industry, that is supposed to be dying on the vine unless it gets help. Let us take a look at this dying industry.

In 1953, the copper industry paid \$6 per share on their common stock. In 1954, they paid \$6 per share on their common stock. In 1955, they paid \$7.75 per share on their common stock. In 1956, they paid \$9.25 per share on their common stock. In 1957, they paid \$7 per share on their common stock.

Oh, what a happy death they are dying with that kind of money. But, we hear nothing about the thousands and thousands of industries that have gone into bankruptcy.

How about the automobile industry in Detroit? What are the Members who represent that area going to tell their people when they go home? It looks like there are about 200,000 unemployed in that area and when the people ask you whether you did anything for them, you are going to have to say, "no, but we took care of about 5,000 other people who are idle."

Now, let us move on to the west coast where there are thousands of working people idle. In the Chicago area the people there are idle by the thousands. There is the steel center in Gary, Ind. There is the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., steelworkers are idle by the thousands but there is not a word in this bill about steel. I am not down here crying for sympathy or anything like that. Life was not too easy for me for a long time. I started working in a coal mine for 35 cents a day and the going was tough. That was 1896. I am old. Yes, very old, and I have seen a lot of life. I know what life was then. I joined the miners union in 1899. I will have been in the union for 60 years come next year. I have been paying dues for a long time. But, I do not think the Wagner Act was passed to have the steel people try to put the finger on Members of Congress for something that they should not be interested in—namely, mining minerals. Steel is their game. I represent the third largest steel center in the country. There are about 66,000 unemployed in that district and there is not a thing in this bill for steel. There is not a thing in this bill for any of these people throughout the Nation. There is nothing in this bill for coal. I remember back in 1902 when there was a coal strike, when they came out of slavery. I took part in that strike for 6 months. The people in those days were put out of the company houses and you lived in a tent for 6 months and you ate cornmeal. You could not buy anything from the company stores. Yet, we hear some people say, "Let us go back to the good old days."

Anybody who talks about the olden days is about 30 years of age. He knows nothing about the olden days. I am telling you, with all the sincerity I can muster, there are less than 10,000 at the most who are out of employment in these 5 minerals covered by this bill. Less than 90,000 are unemployed in the whole mining industry.

Last year President Eisenhower presented his budget to Congress and said on page 89 that there is \$260 million worth of surplus tungsten that the stock-

pile cannot absorb. I gave you the figures yesterday about the large unemployment among the coal miners. There are miners who probably have not worked a day since the Second World War; yet every day they try to better their condition. The Congress has done very little for the miners in the last 15 years.

If Senator Wagner were back with us today, he would not advocate the passing of a Wagner Act to have somebody send for a Congressman off the floor every day and tell them how to vote for the mining industry when their job is to represent the steel industry. But you have them scattered all over here. I am only telling you the facts because I am in a position to tell them to you. I am paid up in the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. If you do not want to do something for Michigan, do not vote to do something for 10,000 who want to get on this gravy train. Do something for the 5 million who are out of work; do something for the aged; do something that will benefit the common good, not just a few.

Remember, Kennecott stock went up 1½ after the close of the stock market yesterday.

What are we going to say when we report back to our bosses, the American people who are our constituents? As I said yesterday, we have got to give an account of our stewardship this fall. When they ask me: "Mike, what did you do for us?", how will it sound to them for me to say I voted to keep 10,000 people working when there are so many other millions not working?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. No, I have only limited time allowed me. In the other body there is not one Senator east of the Rocky Mountains on that Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, not one; everyone on that committee on the Democratic and Republican side alike, comes from west of the Rockies. That is the section that is chiefly getting the good out of this, that and the few mining States in the East in the case of lead and zinc. Let me give you one little illustration of how the West benefits from this. In the Minerals Division of the Interior Department we were draining a lead mine out in Colorado. Every year a bill came into the Congress. I am not talking about Republicans, but Republicans and Democrats alike, a bill came to the Congress for draining that lead mine out in Leadville every year. It cost several million dollars for draining that mine. So one year I stopped it and immediately the Cleveland Trust Co., the largest bank in Ohio, who owned some stock in it sent a letter down to Youngstown, Ohio, to the press, and they sent it to me. The letter protested against stopping this work. And the surprising thing about this letter was that it was written on the letterhead of a bank so rich it could have bought out a good share of the United States Government, they had that much money. But there you have a case of old Uncle Sam and the taxpayers draining that mine in Leadville, Colo., that had not been worked for many years.

I say we have done well by the West. I know what I am talking about, for I have worked in lumber camps, in grain fields, in oil fields in the West. We are spending millions to develop its resources; for mineral and geologic research, for forestry, et cetera. We just approved here today \$4 million more for minerals exploration.

Let me ask you what they are going to think over there in Michigan where they paid billions in taxes and where they have a couple of hundred thousand people out of work and idle? There is nothing in here for them—just \$650 million to subsidize four minerals to help 10,000 miners, chiefly in the West.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I just want to take this time to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he knows how the steelworkers' union stands on this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I want an answer first to the question.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. If the gentleman from Ohio does not care to answer, I can tell him that the steelworkers' union is in favor of this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. That is precisely what the gentleman from Ohio said.

Mr. HILL. I did not yield to the gentleman. I yielded only to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield for an answer to the question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I want to say again that the steelworkers union is in favor of the bill because I do not want the impression left that the steelworkers are complaining.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is just what I say, instead of their staying to their knitting and looking after the interests of the steelworkers here, we find them down here and the steelworkers are paying them to look after their interests.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. If any Member got the idea that that drainage was authorized and the money was furnished by the Congress to drain one mine, of course that is not correct. May I say that the Leadville tunnel was drained prior to that and it was in operation right up until the last year or two. The gentleman from Ohio referred to one mine and left the impression that we were endeavoring to build up a dead industry out in that area. That is not right. This legislation, of course, has nothing to do with that particular area as far as the drainage of the tunnel is concerned.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I want to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Ohio that the steelworkers have lead and zinc and copper miners organized, and members of their union in Utah, Arizona, and Idaho, with a few in Montana, and they are acting in their own self interest to try to take care of their own union affairs.

Mr. HILL. And they are for this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely want to add that the steelworkers are the bargaining agents for the miners of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri who are out of employment at this time also; so the steelworkers have a legitimate interest in getting them back to work.

Mr. HILL. They are supporting the bill; so am I supporting this bill. There is nothing the matter with this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure. I am sure all know of my great interest in agriculture and the welfare of the American farmer. But I am equally concerned with the vital need for a healthy, active, and progressive American mining industry. I know from firsthand experience how essential the mining industry is to the economy of our Nation.

As a former chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business I conducted field investigations of the small mines of America in the principal mining districts in the western United States. Our committee found that the condition of the small mines in every section of the country was deplorable. Our small miners were doing their best under American standards to supply the Nation's requirements for metal and nonmetals. But they were being forced into bankruptcy by unfair competition from cheap-labor mines from outside our country. We found that when mines are active they provide one of the best markets for American farm products and manufactured goods. The miner does not produce a single item he uses. Most of his income is spent in markets in areas where mining is not conducted. He buys automobiles, radios, electric products, and the hundred and one other items any other American worker purchases with his income. He pays local, State, and Federal taxes as does any other small-business man. He contributes liberally of his share of the income from his product to truck lines, railroads, and power companies. He, in a sense, like the farmer, is a part of the basic economy of our great Nation.

In my District he produces lead and zinc in Clear Creek and Gilpen Counties, tungsten and fluorspar in Boulder County, and in northern Colorado near my home in Fort Collins they are developing one of the great fluorspar mines of the country.

It is good for all of us to keep the mines in operation. Not only in times of emergency when imports are cut off but in peace times as well. For when we lose the skill of our miners we will lose one of the greatest assets of a powerful Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure which is designed not only to keep our major mines in operation for a 5-year period but also lends special encouragement for our small operators in the mining business. I commend the Interior Department for coming forth with this program. I commend the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for bringing this measure before us and I thank the leadership of both political parties for supporting this legislation and giving us an opportunity to adopt it before adjournment of this Congress.

I know how badly the legislation is needed. I know it will encourage the production of other metals such as butyl in my District which are badly needed in our defense effort.

I could not conscientiously return to my home in cool, colorful Colorado without urging my colleagues to support this measure and avoid the costly experience of making America totally dependent upon foreign sources for its metals and nonmetals.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise in support of this legislation.

On yesterday reference was made to a letter which was transmitted to the President of the United States last year by the late beloved former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Jere Cooper, and concurred in by the other 14 Democratic members of that committee. That letter dealt specifically with recommendations made by the executive branch of the Government with respect to a condition affecting the lead and zinc industry. The letter was in response to a plea to the committee to consider an approach to this problem entirely different from the one herein recommended. It was therein proposed that we enact, what was called by the administration, a sliding excise tax which, by any other name, was a tariff.

The Democratic members of the committee took the position that if this was the relief sought, then there was existing machinery in the trade-agreements program and in general legislation, ODM authority, and so forth, to deal with the problem. As far as I was concerned personally, I was opposed then and I am opposed now to attempting to solve this type of problem by the tariff approach.

There has been a good bit of discussion here about cost. Let us try to analyze what it would cost the consumer and the Government if we attempted to put a tariff, which was levied at a rate which was protective to these mines. That tariff would be so high that the cost to the Department of Defense for essential items alone, the increase in cost, would, in my judgment, more than offset the entire cost of this proposed legislation.

In addition to that, that does not include 1 penny of the cost involved to the consuming public of the United States automobile industry, the utilities industry, and the countless others who use these vital and strategic minerals and metals.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that we must approach this problem logically, if we possibly can.

I, personally, do not have a copper mine, a lead mine, or a zinc mine within many hundreds of miles of the District which I have the privilege and the honor of representing in this great body. But I think this problem, like so many other problems, is not one which involves the interests of just one particular Congressional District, as important as those interests are; but I think it involves rather the national interest of the United States, and even as much as that, if not more, our position in the world in which we are living.

Let us examine that for a moment. All of us know that we are engaged in a ruthless competition with this atheistic system known as communism. All of us know that the rulers in the Kremlin employ every method known to mankind. This is not a struggle alone between sputniks and submarines and missiles and the land armies and the military. This is a struggle across the board in human endeavor. And one of the most significant of those is in the economic field.

Take aluminum. There is a strategic metal. The Russian competition or the threat of Russian competition has had much to do with the recent depression in the price of aluminum. Aluminum is not the only thing that is being threatened. All down the line, all across the board in the economic range we are being met with the fiercest type of state-controlled, state-operated communistic competition.

Russia decides, let us say, that it will send wheat to India. Some fellow goes to Khrushchev and he says, "This means 50,000 Russians will starve to death, in some province." And Khrushchev says, "So what? This is the second time you have complained to me," or some such thing. That is the type of competition that we are up against.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this program not only has implications here, but it has tremendous implications abroad. I realize that much of the debate here is directed against what is called foreign competition. But most of this foreign competition comes from our friends; copper from Chile, lead and zinc from Peru, from Mexico, and from Canada. These are not our enemies, these are our friends. These are people who help us. These are people we count on in the United Nations and in other organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Not at the moment; I should like to, because I greatly admire and respect the gentleman, but I just cannot at this time.

We must not take the position that this is something directed at the enemies of this Republic; not at all. This is a program, as I see it, which gives stability to an industry which is vital to the economy of our country, which is vital in the economic cold war, which is vital in our relationship with some of our best friends in the world. It will bring about at least a partial solution

to a problem which has been with us for a long time.

Much has been made of the fact that there has been fluctuation in the commodity exchanges. Certainly there has been. Where you have industries living in this condition, the exchanges are going to fluctuate. If you pass this bill I think you will have stability and no such fluctuation.

I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, opponents of S. 4036, the Minerals Stabilization Act, have raised five main objections in this debate. They are as follows:

First, that the act is too costly.

Second, that it is not justified from the standpoint of defense needs.

Third, that a tariff is a better way to save the mining industry.

Fourth, that the measure gives a whopping big subsidy to big mining firms.

Fifth, that minerals should be left in the ground and mined only as they are needed.

Let us consider briefly each of these objections in their order:

The maximum amount which this measure could cost for the first year would be \$156.9 million. This is not all an expenditure because \$82.5 million goes for stockpiling 150,000 tons of copper, which is as good as money in the bank. The mere prospect of passing this legislation could raise the price of copper to 27½¢ a pound and preclude the necessity of the Government buying this \$82.5 million worth. By considering the stockpiling of copper a good investment, which we should, and deducting its cost from the total, the actual cost for the first year could not exceed \$74,457,000.

The estimated maximum cost for the 5-year program, including the copper stockpiling, is \$454.7 million.

The second objection is that this legislation is not justified on the grounds of defense needs. This objection has already been met. My colleagues have shown you in this debate that the estimate of defense needs was based upon the erroneous assumption that our domestic mines would continue to produce at the rate they were producing when the estimate was made. The fact is that they will not continue to produce at that rate because practically all of our remaining lead-zinc mines are operating in the red right now, on a day-to-day basis, just waiting to see the outcome of our vote today before closing down.

Just you take domestic metals out of competition by permitting our mines to close and see what the great foreign cartels will do to us and our economy by way of prices. Prices would skyrocket. We need this legislation for the protection of our economy as well as for the defense of our country.

Now for the third objection; namely, "that a tariff is better." Personally I agree. But my colleagues have told you that for 2 years and more we have literally begged for tariff relief under the escape clause or relief from any source, but without success. It is S. 4036 which you can now pass or nothing. You don't

need to be reminded of the treatment given our Vice President in South America partly as a result of our talk about tariff on lead and zinc, or the unfriendly feelings generated in Canada, to understand the opposition of the State Department to a tariff.

Please note that the Stabilization Act before you will not upset our foreign relations. A tariff inevitably would.

The fourth objection is that "the bill gives a whopping big subsidy to big mining firms." One of the best answers to this objection is title II of the bill itself which has not even been mentioned thus far in the debate. Title II fairly well precludes exactly what the opposition maintains the bill includes. Title II shuts off the help to the big mines at a certain point and adds to the help given the small mines. In addition to providing a maximum of 3.9 cents per pound of lead up to 350,000 tons total production and 2.9 cents per pound of zinc on 550,000 tons total production, the act under title II contributes 1.125 cents per pound of lead and 0.55 cent per pound of zinc on the first 500 tons a mine produces. The larger the mine the less the proportionate assistance, and the smaller the mine the greater the proportionate assistance.

Small mines have been and are the principal casualties. Practically all of the marginal ones have long since succumbed and are beyond the hope of restoration. Those that are left deserve to live, and title II of the Minerals Act will help them to survive.

Now let us consider the fifth objection; namely, that "the minerals should be left in the ground and mined when needed."

The implication here is that a metal mine can be turned on and off at will—like a spigot. This assumption is entirely fallacious because unused mines fill with water, cave in, sell their equipment, and cease all exploration for new ore veins.

Take as a specific example one of our oldest and proven superior mines—the Chief Consolidated Mine at Eureka, Utah, which closed down last October. Testimony in the hearings—Tariff Commission 1957, testimony by Miles Romney—showed that this mine produced 10,000 to 12,000 tons of metals each year, that the cost of reopening would be about \$2,500,000 and that it would take approximately four and one-half years to bring it back into production.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not exactly palatable to most of us but it is either this or a raise in tariff through the escape clause and bring down the wrath of neighboring nations upon our heads. We just cannot think of permitting our remaining lead-zinc mines to close. A vote for this measure is our last chance to save many of them.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman refers to the fact that the cost for 1 year will be \$156 million. That is just for the first year.

Mr. DIXON. That is for the first year, and it is less after that.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think we should clarify the situation with respect to the statement made a moment ago by the gentleman from Ohio. If the price of copper rises to 27.5 cents, there is nothing in this bill for copper.

Mr. DIXON. That is correct. I would almost bet that if this bill is passed copper will go up a cent, and there will be nothing needed for copper. That is where most of the objection has been centered.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not also true that there is no subsidy payment or gravy train or anything in this bill for copper? There is no subsidy of any kind, no stabilization payment, no payment of any kind to the copper industry.

Mr. DIXON. That is true, but suppose we do have to buy \$82 million worth of copper, it is like gold in the bank, anyway. We would sustain no loss.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Like an overwhelming majority of my colleagues, I supported the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and the mutual-security program. However, I have not lost sight of the fact that all our efforts will avail very little if we fail to keep our own economy strong and efficient. At the very foundation of our domestic economy is the mining industry. Without this basic industry we would be weak and ineffective. This is particularly true of lead—a mineral resource with which my own State, Missouri, is blessed. In fact, Missouri is the principal producer of lead in the United States.

I doubt that the average person is aware of the essential uses of lead in our everyday life. Your automobile, which is quite essential, starts with a lead storage battery. Its delicate mechanism operates on electricity properly supplied through the lead battery. It operates on bearings containing lead. Its radiator is put together with lead, and the gasoline it uses contains lead. Your home contains lead—especially in plumbing—and is most likely painted and protected with lead paint. Your telephone messages and the electricity you use are conveyed in lead-covered cables. Protection against atomic radiation depends largely on lead, and thus it goes—I point out these everyday uses of lead to stress the fact that we just cannot afford to let our essential lead resources languish or fall to pieces in the adjustments of other issues. Nothing else is quite so essential to our well-being and security.

Our Government has stimulated and assisted mineral production abroad with American funds. This is justified only if we also give adequate stimulus to our own domestic mineral production. I quote from a publication of the International Cooperation Administration:

Assistance in mining is directed toward helping Peru in its efforts to develop its mineral resources, and to appraise mineral potentialities. Since 1945 the United States

has provided missions for geological investigation in Peru. Some results:

A systematic study of more than 1,000 lead and zinc deposits made in northern Peru gave the Government an estimate on which to base plans for road and concentration plant construction and for providing mining loans to small miners.

A United States technician has been in Peru since 1953 to aid in the development of the Peruvian employment service.

Traditionally, the tariff has been used in the United States to help balance the mining industry. However, for reasons which have been widely discussed, the present administration prefers a subsidy to tariffs. This is not the time to quarrel with this decision. Although the lead miners have expressed a preference for adequate tariff relief, they are willing to cooperate with the Government in the subsidy provided in S. 4036. The miners are desperate, even though they have been and are cooperative. There is no need for any further delay. Other means of Government assistance, such as stockpiling, barter, tax relief, or tariffs, are either unavailable or have been excluded from use for one reason or another. The time has come for action—affirmative and constructive action which will restore the lead-mining industry in this country to its proper role in our economy.

Let me call your attention to the very small comparative amount of support provided in this bill. At the very most, not to exceed \$27 million a year is needed for lead. This amount would be used only if there is no improvement in world lead prices. This amount is paltry when compared with the millions of dollars of Government aid given in subsidies to so many other groups.

One of my colleagues has expressed apprehension over the huge Government stockpile of metals accumulated largely under Public Law 520 for military purposes, and the other stockpile being acquired by the Department of Agriculture through barter. Let me assure my colleagues, they need have no misgivings about the wisdom of the Government in procuring these valuable and imperishable foreign supplies and stockpiling them in the United States. Mines all over the world are becoming increasingly more difficult to find and our own domestic needs are growing at a steady rate. We can well afford to pile up all the foreign metal we can acquire through barter. Future generations will bless us for such foresight.

In closing, I earnestly appeal to my colleagues who support reciprocal trade and mutual security. Surely we owe the provisions of S. 4036 to our own people. And to you who oppose reciprocal trade and foreign aid because, as you insist, we ought to be doing something for our own people, here is your chance. Please, for our own security and well-being, support this stabilization of our basic mining industry.

ST. JOSEPH LEAD CO.,
New York, N. Y., August 18, 1958.
Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have been disturbed to read in the papers some Congress-

sional comment about the proposed mineral stabilization bill, which would imply that large American mining companies with operations abroad are importing minerals and then demanding a subsidy to protect themselves from the imports.

Let me hasten to set the record straight so far as the St. Joseph Lead Co. is concerned. Although we are the largest lead mining company in the United States with roots that go back almost 100 years in Missouri, and although we do mine lead in Argentina, none of our foreign production reaches the United States. All of it is used locally in Argentina.

With kindest regards.

Respectfully yours,

ANDREW FLETCHER,
President.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard here this afternoon the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and others who have made the point that this program is the proper way to approach this problem and that it is certainly the more equitable way and a cheaper way in the long run than to approach it on a tariff basis. And the gentleman has given the background of what occurred last year in the Committee on Ways and Means when dealing with this question.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other point and that is with reference to the situation of the domestic market as it exists today. It has largely been and is a creature of the Federal Government. A good example of this, I think, is copper. Since the Korean war the United States Government has underwritten new copper production of something on the order of 250,000 tons of copper annually at a considerable cost of some two-hundred-and-eighty-odd million dollars. Therefore, since they have on the one hand been provided with and given these incentives and encouragement and in many instances ultimatums to increase production, then I think due to the essential character of these metals, the program provided for in this bill is must legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this domestic minerals bill authorizes an expenditure of \$650 million in subsidies to be paid the copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten industries. It is supposed to assist these industries and their employees. The bill is supported by many outstanding and conscientious Members of the Congress.

The administration also is supporting this subsidy program but despite the favorable views of the Secretary of Interior, I strongly oppose the bill.

It seems to me that we are ignoring large segments of economy when we continue to subsidize and stockpile these mineral resources. I speak for these segments in opposition to this measure.

First of those ignored is, of course, the taxpayer. With the deficit for this fiscal year estimated to run over \$10 billion, we are now proposing to add to that deficit an amount in excess of a half billion dollars.

We are also ignoring those industries and their employees which use these minerals. At this point may I read a letter which I recently received from Mr. A. E. Jacobson, president of the Grand Haven, Mich., Brass Foundry:

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: The Grand Haven Brass Foundry and its employees ask that you vote against the Government's proposition of stockpiling 300 million pounds of copper to bring the price up to 27½ cents.

Our business is beginning to pick up a little and, with the present price, we are able to compete with some of the other materials that have held up and infringed on the brass foundry business.

The Government has so much copper stockpiled at the present time that we cannot figure out why they should have more in stock. The British Government wants to unload 2,000 tons and why should we boost the price on the world market. We feel the only way to adjust the copper market is through the law of supply and demand. Business is starting to pick up and there will be a much greater demand for copper so we feel we should sit tight on copper prices and when the demand exists, the prices will adjust themselves.

We all sincerely hope you will vote no against any propositions of stockpiling copper.

May we hear from you?

Sincerely yours,

GRAND HAVEN BRASS FOUNDRY,
A. E. JACOBSON.

Mr. Jacobson points up the other side of the problem and represents that large group of consumers which should not be ignored.

Then, of course, the ultimate consumer is also adversely affected by any artificial stimulus to higher prices. It is self-evident that legislation to increase the cost of raw materials is going to be reflected in the prices of articles purchased by the ultimate consumer, you and me, all of us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has given the mineral industries and administration an alternative method for attacking the problem of surpluses in these industries. They may proceed under the "peril point" and "escape clause" provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. Congress intended these provisions to be used. We did not intend that they should be bypassed when the going got rough.

I am opposed to this Minerals Stabilization Act because of its costs to the taxpayers, its effect on consumers, both at the fabricating level and at the consumption level, and because an alternative approach to the problem is presently available under Federal law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] yield me additional time?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It was my understanding that the gentleman could not get any time on the other side and he talked me into an agreement to yield him 4 minutes. Not having a full understanding of what transpired on that side of the aisle, I am not going to go back on my agreement and I yield him 4 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentlemen from Texas and from Nebraska. I did appeal to my side and I was unable at the time to secure any time as it was all allocated.

I thank my good and able friend from Texas whom I greatly admire, for the consideration he has given me. I also want to say to the House that the gentleman from Texas is recognized as one of our outstanding Members who by his work has won the great admiration of the Members on both sides of the aisle. He has been most considerate of my request for time.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation before us today calls for a program of incentive payments designed to maintain what is referred to as a small production of minerals. It may be a small production but the estimated cost is approximately half a billion dollars—which is no small amount.

It would appear to me that the Government today is becoming a Government of pressure groups—in fact, a Government of subsidies. We subsidize many and varied programs—from agriculture to minerals we are creating a utopia where no one can lose. The Government will protect and finance all phases of our economic and social life. We may go bankrupt and create chaos; however, these programs must go on.

We are facing a \$12 billion deficit in fiscal year 1959. We recently increased the national debt by \$13 billion. It would appear that we are definitely headed for a \$300 billion national debt.

How long the country can continue these spending programs without eventually leading to bankruptcy is problematical.

Let me remind the House that it is about time we approach these legislative proposals in a practical, realistic, common sense manner. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my friend, Mr. KIRWAN, made a very able presentation. We must not be influenced by these various pressure groups. We must determine whether these programs are sound and for the best interest of the country as a whole.

Certainly we did not build our country on subsidy programs. America was built by hard work, thrift, and frugality.

It would appear, as I have stated, that we are trying to develop a utopia where everything will be subsidized. This system of ours cannot stand this terrific impact and debt without ending up in difficulties.

Unless we change the trend I am quite certain we will end up with a bureaucratic Government overlordship all phases of our economic and industrial life.

Now, what is the difference between this program and a program subsidizing the automobile industry when it becomes overstocked with automobiles. In a time of surplus production, the Government would buy and stockpile automobiles so that the automobile manufacturers could continue to buy steel uninterruptedly. There would be no slackening or curtailing in the production of steel and automobiles, and no men would be laid off in these areas. Everybody could operate in a regular manner.

This same principle could apply to radios, television sets, pottery in Ohio, coal in Pennsylvania, textiles in the New England States, or any other item in overproduction. Now let us not pick out one segment of our economy or one industry and subsidize it. Certainly that is what you are attempting to do here in this bill.

There is no demand for the production of these minerals. There is an ample stockpile. Now you are working on what is called an incentive program.

Why we should develop legislation for a program of incentive payments designed to maintain a small domestic production of minerals, I am unable to understand.

Incentive, or whatever it is, the Government is putting up a half billion dollars to keep them in operation. There has been ample stockpiling of all of these materials. Do not be misled by the term "incentive program."

Why we get into programs of this nature I am unable to understand. Certainly we cannot pick out one particular branch of industry to give preferred attention and give no consideration to the coal industry of Pennsylvania, the steel industry of Ohio, the pottery industry of Ohio, the textile industry of the New England States, and every other industry that is having a difficult time and where employees also have been laid off by the thousands.

You are establishing a precedent here that you cannot live up to. It is unfair that any one particular segment of our industrial life should be given preferred attention over any other branch of industry.

It is about time that we looked at these programs in a good, sound, common sense manner. Before long we are going to be in debt \$300 billion. We are paying \$7½ billion annually in interest on our national debt.

Now, this great Nation of ours has given us what we have and this great system under which we have operated has opened the doors for opportunities for all of us. My interest is to see that the same opportunities are offered to the generations of tomorrow—the freedom of thought, freedom of operation, and the freedom to create and do the things that will continue to build a great America. You cannot do it, my friends, by carrying on programs of subsidies in every phase of our economic, industrial, and agricultural life, all of which will lead us to inflation and bankruptcy.

We are duly elected as representatives of the people to protect the solvency of this Nation. I sincerely hope that we have the courage of our convictions to approach these various legislative programs from a practical, sound, common-sense manner.

Let me state, the only legacy that we are leaving for the generations that follow is a backbreaking debt that will bear down on them for the next 75 to 100 years.

What a legacy to leave to the youth of tomorrow.

We should get back to the old common-sense way of handling things. Therefore, I trust this legislation will be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. One of the big arguments made against this bill that has been raised here today is that we are giving subsidies to whopping big industries that do not need it.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that title II of this bill does exactly the opposite. After a certain point is reached it cuts off the big industries. It benefits the little industries. For instance, after a mine produces 500 tons, it gets no help under title II. All of the small mines that produce under that amount get a great deal of help under title II. They get 1.12 cents per pound on lead and 55 cents for zinc up to 500 tons, is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIXON. This bill does exactly the opposite to what it has been reported to do. The charge that we are giving the money to whopping big corporations is not correct.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The bill was not drafted with the intent of helping any big organization, as the gentleman has so well pointed out.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I tried to put this bill back into perspective, but it seems it has gone out again today. The gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], both fine Members of the House and good friends of mine, have succeeded in making this bill look like a relief bill. This is not a relief bill. This is not a bill to end unemployment in any area. If I thought that was the thesis behind this bill, I would not blame anybody for opposing it because all of you have unemployment in your districts.

You all have your own problems, and certainly I would not blame you one bit if you felt that we in the West or we from the mineral producing areas were trying to put our problems ahead of yours. That is just not the case.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Those of us who support the bill support it because we feel that this industry is necessary to the welfare of the Nation. It is strange to some of us that in the bill we passed this afternoon we had an appropriation for \$680 million in 1 year to purchase uranium, and yet here we have in this bill some of the metals that are just as important to the future of America as uranium, and in the 5-year program we have a \$458 million authorization only.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

That brings me to the next point I wanted to make, and that is that this bill is for the defense of this country. The gentleman from Pennsylvania—and heaven only knows, he is a fine Member of the House, but he tries to show this bill in the light of a relief bill, as a bill

which is trying very desperately to give this industry some advantage that some other industry does not have. Well, of course, there is some difference between trying to save an industry which is vital to national defense and in trying to save some of the industries which the gentleman talked about. The whole difference between this and the Brannan plan, and the whole difference between granting subsidies to any other industry, is defense, and do not forget it. Can you Members of the House possibly have forgotten the scurry which went through this country in World War II and the Korean war when we were trying desperately to get the sinews of war, the minerals and the metals needed to win the war? Of course you cannot. Sure, this bill may cost a little money, but you have never seen anything as expensive as trying to prospect for ore, trying to construct mines for and trying to produce strategic minerals and metals in a situation where you have no time, where you have only a national emergency, where you are having ships which are carrying strategic minerals to our shores shot out from under us by torpedoes from the enemy and where we have no choice but to spend all the money that is necessary, all the time that is necessary, in order to bring to these shores the minerals and metals which we must have to prosecute a war. I say to you, my friends, that the cost of this bill will be found to be very small indeed if we find that again—and please God it will not—this Nation is involved in a shooting war. This body and every Member of it will then thank his lucky stars that he was wise enough at the proper time to support a bill which is designed to keep an industry going, which is the most vital industry to any war effort which any of us could imagine. I say, keep it going, and that is all that we can do, because there is no profit in this bill for anybody. All we want to do is to allow the domestic mining industry to proceed on a minimal basis to keep the mines open, to keep them from flooding, to keep the timbers from rotting, to keep the machinery from rusting so that this great industry will be ready in the event the country needs it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, this debate on the bill has taken the same turn as the debate on the rule. Before I make the few remarks that I want to make in closing the general debate on the bill I want to call the attention of every Member of this House to the first phrase in a very important statement that was made by Daniel Webster, which graces this side of the Chamber, high up. It says:

Let us develop the resources of our land.

That is what this bill is for. That is why it was brought before the Congress. It is not a stockpiling bill. It is not a relief bill. It is not a defense bill, except for what it contributes in good, sound advancement of civilization in bringing about those results. They are merely facets in the problem that are served by following a sound policy.

And I say to you that this is a sound policy.

I want to repeat what I said on the rule. When this matter first came to my attention I was against it. I was opposed to it for many, many reasons and many of them were the reasons that have been brought out on this floor by the gentleman from Ohio, a very able Member of this House, Mr. KIRWAN; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PILLION, a very dear friend of mine, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GAVIN. They did a wonderful job. They are dedicated Congressmen. They do everything that they think is right and certainly I yield to their judgment in what they do. But I have studied this bill. We held extensive hearings on it and we found out what the trouble was so far as this industry is concerned.

I want to talk about just a few of the things that were mentioned, in closing this debate. Much was said about unemployment. Of course, this bill will help employment—of course it will. Any sound piece of legislation in America helps employment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that I am in complete accord with the views he has expressed concerning this important measure. I have a definite interest in the pending measure for the very great reason that the largest tungsten mine in America is located in my District. That mine has been closed since the month of June. About five or six hundred breadwinners are now in idleness. The management will reopen this mine and start up the operation if this bill becomes law, although the price of tungsten provided in the bill is just about the average cost of production in a well-operated mining operation.

I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I want to say that we had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture would enter into this debate, but he was in a conference committee and did not get back to the House until just a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, I want to touch on tungsten for just a few moments. I think it is a very important matter to call to the attention of this House. But returning for a moment to the question of employment, let me say that if something is not done to shore up this industry in America, you are going to have more unemployment in this industry. Certain figures were used. We were told there were only a few thousand unemployed. Please listen to this. When a miner becomes unemployed he becomes unemployed because there is no mining to do. Where does he go? He goes to the railroad or the steel mills or some place else. Then when he becomes unemployed, that unemployment is not charged up as unemployment of a miner. It is the same with the farmer in agriculture. When they leave the farms, they

go to the cities to obtain employment to feed their families. Let me say that we have made a tragic mistake in that regard, because over three-fourths of a million farm families have been driven off the farm since 1951 into these cities. They constitute part of the unemployment that is plaguing our country today. If we will get this economy shored up as it should be, these people who are unemployed will go back where they came from, and you will not have the unemployment that you have in many of the steel centers, in many of the automobile centers, and so forth.

In that regard I want to say this. Some have talked about the philosophy of this matter; that is, because we can get it cheaper somewhere else, because we can get some of these minerals cheaper from foreign sources, that we ought to do that.

Just trace that out to its logical end. We can buy wheat cheaper in Canada, we can buy wheat cheaper in lots of places than we can raise it in America. Why do we not stop growing wheat, and stop making automobiles, and stop producing pottery, and start buying them from foreign countries? The trouble is, they do not think far enough and realize there would not be anything to buy them with.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas on his excellent presentation of a problem that is not necessarily peculiar to the West but is one that faces the entire Nation, that is, the opportunity we have to continue a basic industry. If you do not pass this legislation, I think the record is clear that most of the mines will be compelled to close.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In line with the gentleman's argument, we have a wool program that protects the wool producers of America. We have a sugar program that protects the sugar beet and sugar cane producers of America. All we are asking here is something to protect the miners, who are contributing to the welfare of America.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

We have the defense stockpile situation. Some people look so far and no further. They talk about this great stockpile. Let me say to you with regard to these minerals, I would much prefer to have a stockpile program, but we do not have a stockpile program. We were told 4 years ago that the administration was going to work out a long-term minerals program, and present it to us for some action. We waited on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for that program for 4 years, and this is what we got. It is a baby that was put on our doorstep at the last minute before this Congress closed. Why was that done? Because the minerals people had been

given to understand that they would be taken care of in the reciprocal-trade program. They were not taken care of in the reciprocal-trade program, as all of you well know. We are at the end of the rope, we are at the close of Congress, and something has to be done, not to stop some unemployment—of course it will do that—not to produce something for a stockpile, not to produce something just for the general economy of this country, but to provide at least a partial self-sufficiency for this country in some strategic and I say indispensable minerals that must be had as we go into the future.

I wish I had time to give you the benefit of what came before us in the hearings, and I wish you would take time to read them. I think most of you would realize that this is not a nickel-and-dime situation, this is a situation where we may be facing our survival, that is, whether or not we survive, because what we are doing is this: We are moving into an era in the advance of civilization when we are going to need tremendous supplies of very high heat-resistant metals. We are going to need a tremendous supply of fuel. People that think that you can be pennywise right now are going to find out that we have been pound foolish. The thing this Congress ought to do is go into this program as the groundwork, the very beginning of what will have to be done in the future in meeting the requirements.

Take tungsten for instance, as was mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina. I want to say this about it.

If you will look in the records, you will find today Russia claims to have the greatest reserves of tungsten in the world. And who was making that claim before Russia? It was Red China and Red China could prove it. Russia and Red China together have over 50 percent of the world's reserve in tungsten today and that is the world's proven reserves. How are we going to know whether we have any reserves or not if we are going to cut off any possible program and say that because we can get it from Korea or get it from someplace else a little bit cheaper than we can produce it in America, we are simply going to say we are not going to do it. You know what will happen if war comes along. You know exactly what will happen. The same thing will happen that happened with reference to the manganese situation during the last war when the German enemy with their submarines, when they were short of ammunition, they would pick one or two or three ships out of a convoy of 70 ships because they were carrying manganese. That is exactly what happened. We hear about the need for these high heat resisting metals. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] who is the distinguished acting chairman of the committee at this time has a chart which I would like him to show to you.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ASPINALL. As the gentleman from Texas just stated, I hold in my

hand a chart which shows the present use of metals and their heat resistant point as far as effectiveness is concerned. You will find this ferrous or iron level. Here is where your metals of today will become unusable as far as heat is concerned. To get up to the area where you get a heat resistant operation, you have to get up to the tungsten area and this "W" is "W" for wolfram, now called tungsten. It is in the use of tungsten that the future of the United States is dependent so far as its use in missiles and airplanes and cones that they talk about are concerned. That is why tungsten is important to our survival at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I think that points it up as to what we need to do. The question before this House is whether or not we are going to stay in this indispensable metals industry or are we going to get out of it. I say we should stay in it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that S. 4036, a bill to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, tungsten and acid-grade fluorspar and for other purposes, will receive favorable action by this Congress today. The mining industry in the United States, and especially in the tristate mining area of Kansas, Oklahoma and Missouri where lead and zinc are produced, is in desperate circumstances due to the world price now being paid for these metals.

The tristate mines and smelters cannot operate under present world price conditions. Consequently all of our mines have shut down and our smelters are not in operation.

During World War I 50 percent of the lead and zinc mined in the United States was produced in this district. During World War II, over 12 percent of the lead and zinc produced by our country came from this area. The United States produces only 40 percent of its needs at the present time, and we are only asking for protection which is granted in this bill to maintain our domestic production.

Mr. Chairman, the mining industry has always been considered one of our basic producers of new wealth. The Membership of the House today is going to determine by its vote on S. 4036 whether this basic industry will survive or be abandoned. These mines cannot be allowed to lay idle any great length of time because of accumulation of water in them. It is a constant fight to keep this underground water pumped out, for if it is allowed to accumulate, the mines will have to be abandoned. The measure we are considering today is the only way we can maintain our domestic mineral output, and if this measure is enacted, it will permit the orderly readjustment of domestic production to all normal commercial markets. This program, if

enacted, will not interfere with friendly countries abroad who are now supplying us with a great deal of our domestic mineral needs.

I cannot conceive of the Congress not taking favorable action on this program which is absolutely necessary for the survival of a great many of our domestic mines. I do not believe that the House of Representatives wants to accept the responsibility of allowing this basic industry to collapse and for us to become dependent altogether on foreign imports for our metal needs.

It is imperative that we get a favorable vote on S. 4036. The Nation's security and welfare is bound too closely to this metal program for the Congress not to take favorable action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Minerals Act of 1958."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVNS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines, had come to no resolution thereon.

WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 441)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 11581, "To remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the 'unfit for human consumption' category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes."

Virtually all of the seed wheat entering the United States comes from Canada. Much of the wheat so imported is treated with poisonous substances which act as inhibitors of wheat diseases and insects. As such wheat is unfit for human consumption, it is so classified under the Tariff Act. Under the classification, "wheat unfit for human consumption," treated seed wheat is dutiable at 5 percent ad valorem (about 10 cents per bushel at current prices) as compared with a duty of 21 cents per bushel on all other imported wheat, including untreated seed wheat. The present measure would reclassify treated seed wheat and put it in the straight "wheat" classification, thereby making it subject to the higher rate of duty.

The duty on wheat unfit for human consumption was reduced from 10 to 5 percent ad valorem in a bilateral agree-

ment with Canada effective in 1939. The present rate was bound under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1948. These agreements recognize the right of the United States to raise duties or impose quotas should imports, at current rates of duty, of wheat unfit for human consumption seriously injure or threaten injury to domestic producers. Similar protection is provided under these international agreements and the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to imports which interfere with programs of the Department of Agriculture.

There is, in the record, no claim that the present rate of duty is imposing a hardship on anyone, or interfering with any program of the Department of Agriculture. Our laws provide a method for making and sustaining such a claim, which has not been invoked in this case. While, in some respects, seed wheat classifications may be anomalous, this seems a scant basis for taking an action which, I believe, would violate our international agreements, and be inimical to the trade policy of the United States, the interests of our farmers, and our relations with Canada.

The United States is constantly working to reduce the barriers to world trade. The latest manifestation of this effort is the recent and overwhelming endorsement by the Congress of a 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Tariff reduction without serious hardship to our domestic producers is an integral part of our trade policy. Approval of H. R. 11581 would be inconsistent with this policy and would not be understood by our trading partners, particularly Canada.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 20, 1958.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize Members now to send bills to conference and to concur in Senate amendments.

ADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE, STATEMENTS AND CONFESSIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, WILIS, KEATING, and CRAMER.

EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13757) to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman from South Dakota will not press for consideration of the bill. This bill has been calendared for consideration under suspension of the rules. I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that this has been cleared with the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN. I am wondering if the gentleman from Illinois is aware of that fact.

Mr. ARENDS. I may also say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I have information that a number of Members wish to discuss this matter and would object to its being called up for consideration now. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5497) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "recreational and."

Lines 10 and 11, strike out "recreational and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENTS TO CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12883) to provide for certain improvements relating to the Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "oil-burning."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "oil."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me if this has been cleared by the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Public Works?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It has been cleared with the ranking member of the Public Works Committee and the leadership on that side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4642) to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 6, line 20, after "amounts" insert "not to exceed a total of \$75,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me if this has been cleared by the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. The only amendment is a limitation on the expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12808) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 to extend for an additional 2 years the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "June 30, 1960, 1961, and 1962." and insert "June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961."

After line 6 insert:

"Sec. 2. That the sixth sentence of section 108 (d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 379) is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary of Commerce shall make a revised estimate of cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after

taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1961.'"

Amend the title to read as follows: "An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 by advancing the date for submission of the revised estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System and to extend the approval of such estimate for an additional year."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOATING SAFETY ON THE NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11078) to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "7½" and insert "10."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what change was made in this bill?

Mr. BONNER. This raises the power limit from 7½ horsepower to 10 horsepower. This has all been cleared with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], with the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN], and with the leadership.

Mr. ARENDS. It was cleared with some of the Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle who were interested in this?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11078, the small boat safety bill, as it came back to the House from the other body, provides for the numbering of all undocumented vessels powered with more than 10 horsepower. I be-

lieve it would have been a better bill if it covered all powered vessels including those of 10 horsepower and less as was originally intended. Nevertheless, it is still a very good bill.

Under it all undocumented vessels propelled by machinery of more than 10 horsepower using the navigable waters of the United States must be numbered, by the States in those States which adopt the overall numbering system, and by the Federal Government otherwise. While the Federal numbering system under Federal law applies only to undocumented vessels with more than 10 horsepower, there is nothing in the bill to prevent the States from numbering all undocumented vessels including those of 10 horsepower and less. It should also be noted that while the Federal authorities will not number undocumented vessels of 10 horsepower or less, the Coast Guard will still enforce the provisions of the Motor Boat Act of 1940, which have to do with running lights, fire prevention and lifesaving equipment, negligent and reckless operation, etc., with regard to all mechanically propelled boats regardless of how small or of how little power.

Under the bill the Secretary of the Treasury, probably through the Coast Guard, will establish an overall numbering system which will apply to all vessels which the Federal Government will number and which may be adopted by each of the several States so desiring, for vessels propelled by machinery of more than 10 horsepower. It is my hope that the overall numbering system will be so constituted that States which desire to use it may also apply the numbers to vessels of 10 horsepower and less if they wish to number all vessels. It may well be that the Congress will wish to make a similar extension of the numbering system to additional small boats and it would be well if the overall numbering system now instituted should be adaptable if and when such future extensions of the law are adopted.

It is to be hoped that the States adopting the overall numbering system will have in mind in connection with State legislation and agreements between the several States that uniformity of laws and reciprocity of treatment is highly desirable for the full enjoyment of the recreation which boating makes available to those who take their boats from State to State. Any State has the power to enforce its laws on its own intrastate waters. The adoption of the overall numbering system will qualify a State to enforce its laws on the navigable waters of the United States within such a State. It must, of course, thereafter number undocumented vessels of over 10 horsepower in accordance with the overall numbering system. There is nothing in the bill to prevent it from numbering additional vessels as has been stated. It could also enforce on the navigable waters of the United States all its laws otherwise regulating the use of undocumented vessels. A State could, as some States now do, in addition to requiring a number in accordance with the overall numbering system which will identify a vessel regardless of where it

is found, require additional licenses to operate either motors or boats or both on the waters within the State. Arrangements between the States with regard to reciprocity of treatment in such instances will be very desirable.

The bill includes the provision for the collection of statistics with regard to accidents and their compilation in the office of the Secretary for whom the Coast Guard will probably act. For the first time we will have a comprehensive body of statistics which will furnish factual information with regard to the dangers implicit in the use of small boats. The Federal Government and the several States will have available therefrom a source of information upon which to make future changes in law which will make the use of small boats safer.

Under the bill there will be available to the Coast Guard the right to use the simplified civil penalty procedure ordinarily comparable to State procedures in connection with very minor offenses including violation of the laws against reckless and negligent operation of small boats of all sizes provided for in the Motor Boat Act of 1940. In addition, and in other respects, civil penalties under H. R. 11078 are changed sufficiently to make them more effective. Heretofore, the penalty of \$10 for failure to number a vessel required to be numbered was not always sufficient to cause a person to wish to avoid the penalty.

H. R. 11078 as it comes before us is a good bill. Primarily it is an enabling act which will permit the several States to have concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal Government over the navigable waters within their respective boundaries and to enforce their respective laws on all the waters within such boundaries whether they be intrastate waters or navigable waters of the United States. The States can, and it is hoped that they will, assume the responsibility for numbering undocumented vessels propelled by machinery and for the passage and enforcement of laws which will make the use of small boats and the great recreational resource which they involve as safe as may be possible.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 27 OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1920

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9833) to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 6, after "carrier" insert "subject to part 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me if this has been cleared with the ranking minority members?

Mr. BONNER. It has been cleared with all sides.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT OR NEAR MIAMI, MO.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3776) to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1093), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "twenty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty-five years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12216) to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River, near Carthage, Tenn., as the "Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 2, insert:

"TITLE I"

Page 1, line 3, preceding "That" insert "SECTION 101."

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"TITLE II"

"SEC. 201. That the purpose of this title is—

"(a) to provide for an integrated and co-operative investigation, study, and survey by a commission created pursuant to this title and composed of representatives of certain departments and agencies of the United States, and of the State of Texas, in connection with, and in promotion of, the conservation, utilization, and development of the land and water resources of the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins (and intervening areas) in the State of Texas in order to formulate a comprehensive and coordinated plan for—

"(1) flood control and prevention;

"(2) domestic and municipal water supplies;

"(3) the improvement and safeguarding of navigation;

"(4) the reclamation and irrigation of land, including drainage;

"(5) possibilities of hydroelectric power and industrial development and utilization;

"(6) soil conservation and utilization;

"(7) forest conservation and utilization;

"(8) preservation, protection, and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources;

"(9) the development of recreation;

"(10) salinity and sediment control;

"(11) pollution abatement and the protection of public health; and

"(12) such other beneficial and useful purposes not herein enumerated; and

"(b) to formulate, within the time provided for in section 209 of this title, a basic, comprehensive, and integrated plan of development of the land water resources within the area described in this section for submission to, and consideration by, the President and the Congress, and to make recommendations, after adequate study, for executing and keeping current such plan. It is not the purpose of this title to create any continuing or permanent instrumentality of the Federal Government or to take from, or reassign, the duties and powers of any department or agency of the United States represented on the Commission, except as herein provided in this title.

"SEC. 202. In carrying out the purposes of this title it shall be the policy of Congress to—

"(1) recognize and protect the rights and interests of the State of Texas in determining the development of the watersheds of the rivers herein mentioned and its interests and rights in water utilization and control, as well as the preservation and protection of established uses;

"(2) protect existing and authorized projects and projects under construction whether public or private;

"(3) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and continuing investigational programs of the departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States;

"(4) recognize an important body of existing Federal law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, flood control, grazing, geological survey, national parks, mines, and minerals; and

"(5) to recognize the primary responsibilities of the State of Texas and local interests in such State in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with such State and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple purpose projects.

"SEC. 203. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members appointed by the President as follows:

"(1) One member, who shall serve as Chairman, and who shall be a resident from the area comprising the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces and San Jacinto River Basins (and intervening areas) embraced within the State of Texas and who shall not, during the period of his service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this title without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compen-

sation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$12,000 in any one calendar year;

"(2) Six members of whom one shall be from the Department of the Army, one from the Department of Commerce, one from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one from the Department of Agriculture, one from the Department of Interior, and one from the Federal Power Commission; and

"(3) Seven members, nominated by the Governor of Texas subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, each of which shall be a resident of a different one of the following geographical areas of Texas:

- "(A) Neches River Basin;
- "(B) Trinity River Basin;
- "(C) Brazos River Basin;
- "(D) Colorado River Basin;
- "(E) Guadalupe-San Antonio River Basin;
- "(F) Nueces River Basin; and
- "(G) San Jacinto River Basin.

"(c) In the event of the failure of the Governor of the State of Texas to nominate a person or persons in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section satisfactory to the President within 60 days after a request by the President for such nomination, the President shall then select and appoint a qualified resident from the State of Texas.

"(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(e) Within 30 days after the appointment of the members of the Commission by the President, and funds have been made available by the Congress as provided for in this title, the Commission shall organize for the performance of its functions.

"(f) The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(g) Eight members of the Commission, of whom at least four shall have been appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

"(h) Members of the Commission shall report from time to time to their respective departments or agencies, or to the Governor of the State of Texas if appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, on the work of the Commission, and any comments and suggestions pertaining to such work from such departments, agencies, or governor shall be placed before the Commission for its consideration.

"(i) The Commission shall cease to exist within 3 months from the date of its submission to the President of its final report as provided for in section 209 of this title. All property, assets, and records of the Commission shall thereupon be turned over for liquidation and disposition to such agency or agencies in the executive branch as the President shall designate.

"Sec. 204. The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, administer such oaths, and publish so much of its proceedings and the reports thereon as it may deem advisable; lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States Government; have printing and binding done in its discretion by establishments other than the Government Printing Office; employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as

amended; purchase or hire, operate, maintain, and dispose of such vehicles as it may require; secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this title; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, and employees of the departments or agencies from which persons have been appointed to the Commission pursuant to section 203 (b) (2) of this title may be assigned upon request by the Chairman of the Commission to temporary duty with the Commission without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status; pay travel in accordance with standardized Government Travel Regulations and other necessary expenses incurred by it, or any of its officers or employees, in the performance of duties vested in such Commission; and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform the functions vested in such Commission under this title.

"Sec. 205. Responsibility shall be vested in the Chairman for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds: *Provided*, That in carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission.

"Sec. 206. (a) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 203 (b) (2) of this title shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) Members of the Commission, other than those appointed pursuant to section 203 (b) (2) of this title, shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties, but the aggregate compensation received by the members of the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$12,000 per annum in the case of the Chairman, and \$7,500 per annum in the case of members of the Commission other than those members appointed pursuant to section 203 (b) (2) of this title.

"Sec. 207. In the formulation of a comprehensive and coordinated plan or plans for (a) the control, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins (and intervening areas), (b) conservation and development of the land resources of such area; (c) flood control, navigation, reclamation, agriculture purposes, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and (d) such other needs as are set forth in paragraph (a) of the first section of this title, the Commission shall—

"(1) seek to secure maximum public benefits for the State of Texas and the Nation consistent with the specific directions contained in section 208 and elsewhere in this title;

"(2) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and reports of existing Government agencies and shall encourage the completion of such current and additional studies and investigations by such agencies as will further the purposes of this title, and such agencies are

authorized to cooperate within the limits of available funds and personnel to the end that the Commission may carry out its functions as expeditiously as possible;

"(3) take into consideration the financial, physical, and economic benefits of existing and prospective Federal works constructed or to be constructed consistent with the purposes of this title;

"(4) include in its plan or plans estimated costs and benefits; recommendations relating to the establishment of pay-out schedules (areawide or otherwise) taking into account the Federal Government's present and prospective investment in the area; costs reimbursable and nonreimbursable; sources for reimbursement; returns heretofore made from existing projects and estimates of returns from recommended projects; repayment schedules for water, irrigation, industrial, and other uses; power rates and recommendations for the marketing thereof in such manner as to encourage its most widespread use at the lowest possible rates consistent with the return of capital investment and interest thereon; and

"(5) offer in its plan or plans proposals for the construction and operation of the projects contained therein, and designate the functions and activities of the various Federal departments and agencies in connection therewith consistent with existing law, except that no such plan or plans shall include final project designs and estimates.

"Sec. 208. In the formulation of its plan or plans and in the preparation of its report to the President, the Commission shall comply with the following directives:

"(1) The report shall contain the basic comprehensive plan for the development of the water and land resources of the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins (and intervening areas) formulated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of, and to accomplish the purposes of, this title;

"(2) The Commission and the participating Federal departments and agencies shall comply substantially with the intent, purposes, and procedure set forth in the first section of the act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes', approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

"Sec. 209. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to prepare a final report, within the time provided for in this section, for submission to the President. Before the Commission takes final action on the approval of such report for submission to the President, it shall transmit a copy of such report to each department, agency, and to the Governor of the State of Texas referred to in subsection (b) of section 203 of this title. Within 90 days from the date of receipt by each such department and agency, and by the Governor of the State of Texas of such proposed report, the written views, comments, and recommendations of such department, agency, and Governor shall be submitted to the Commission. The Commission may adopt in its report to the President any views, comments, and recommendations so submitted and change its report accordingly. The Commission shall transmit to the President, with its final report, the submitted views, comments, and recommendations of each such department and agency, and of the Governor of the State of Texas whether or not adopted by such Commission.

"(3) The President shall, within 90 days after the receipt by him of the final report of the Commission, transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

"(d) The final report of the Commission and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

"SEC. 210. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this title."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn., as the 'Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir' and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us whether this has been cleared with the ranking member of the committee on this side of the aisle?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. Also with the minority leadership.

Mr. BALDWIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have four unanimous consent requests that have been cleared with the leadership and by the members of the committees.

CROW CREEK SIOUX RESERVATION INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12670) to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, South Dakota, whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$2,019,219.94" and insert "\$1,395,811.94."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINE RIDGE SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7860) to amend section 1 of the act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 625), entitled "To provide that payments be made to certain

members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 4 over to and including line 12 on page 2 and insert:

"That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay the sum of \$3,500 to each of the following Indians or their estates: Edith Apple Bear, Ephriam Brafford, Catherine Jones Brewer, Lamont Cook, Eloise Ruff Garnett, Jake Harvey, Ambrose Hernandez, Floyd F. Hernandez, Thomas Hollow Horn, Steven L. Hunter, Edward Janis, Jr., Norman Janis, George Jensen, William Jones, Carrie Knee, Clency Kocer, Seth P. Martinez, Walter Martinez, George Mountain Sheep, Jack O'Rourke, Wilbur Pourier, Josephine Thunder Bull, Gilbert Twiss, Martha E. Clifford Whiting, Patrick O'Rourke, William Clifford, Bertha Huebner Darling, and Loren Pourier."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OAHE DAM ON THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12662) to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "\$3,937,832" and insert "\$3,299,513."

Page 5, line 8, strike out "\$8,500,000" and insert "\$6,960,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOWER BRULE SIOUX RESERVATION INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12663) to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$1,175,231" and insert "\$976,523."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 648) providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 4, after "States," insert "Secretaries of departments, heads of independent agencies, offices and commissions."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUS A GUERRA

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12632) authorizing Gus A Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "4 years" and insert "1 year."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "6 years" and insert "2 years."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 85-422

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3966) to amend Public Law 85-422.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 4 (a) of Public Law 85-422 is amended by striking out "and persons with two or less years of service for basic pay purposes who were retired for physical disability or placed on the temporary disability retired list."

(b) This amendment shall take effect on June 1, 1958.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12303) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after "may", insert "with the concurrence of the Governor."

Page 3, line 4, after "comptroller," insert "or if the Governor does not concur in the taking of an appeal to the Secretary."

Page 3, strike out lines 19 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 7. The last sentence of section 24 of said act is amended to read as follows: 'The Attorney General shall appoint a United States marshal for the Virgin Islands, to whose office the provisions of chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply.'"

Page 4, strike out lines 9 to 18, inclusive.

Page 4, strike out all after line 18 over to and including line 4 on page 5.

Page 5, line 5, strike out "12" and insert "10."

Page 5, line 8, strike out all after "government" down to and including "government," in line 10.

Page 5, line 16, after "the" where it appears the second time insert "public interest by."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "13" and insert "11."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell me if this has been cleared with the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. It has.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3268) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House the purpose of the legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. This is a bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act. The purpose of the legislation is to facilitate the operation of the National Science Foundation by permitting the 24-man National Science Board to delegate authority to its executive committee or to the director of the Foundation. It is requested by the National Science Foundation as necessary to the administration of the act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this meets the entire accord of the committee on this side, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is amended in the following manner:

Section 4 (d) and section 4 (e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Board shall meet annually on a day during the last 2 weeks of May and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(e) The first chairman and vice chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a chairman and vice chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the second annual meeting occurring after each such election. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (b) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 of this act, together with such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 10 or 11 (c) unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken, or such action is taken pursuant to the terms of a delegation of authority from the Board to the Director or to the executive committee."

SEC. 3. Section 6 (a) and section 6 (b) (1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members an executive committee, and to assign to the executive committee such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this

act as it deems appropriate; except that the Board may not assign to the executive committee the function of establishing policies.

"(b) If an executive committee is established by the Board—

"(1) such committee shall consist of the Director, as a nonvoting ex officio member, and not less than 5 nor more than 9 other members elected by the Board from among their number;

"(2) the term of office of each voting member of such committee shall be 2 years, except that (A) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the term of office of 4 of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this act shall be 1 year;

"(3) any person who has been a member of such committee for 6 consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the 2-year period following the expiration of such sixth year;

"(4) the membership of such committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation;

"(5) such committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the executive committee shall be included in such reports."

SEC. 4. Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is amended, to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to section 16, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at appropriate nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of demonstrated and potential ability; but in any case in which 2 or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant 1 to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 5. Section 11 (c), section 11 (d), and section 11 (e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such scientific activities as the foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to

the national defense, and, when deemed appropriate by the foundation, such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific activities without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 529);

"(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, and to hold and dispose of by grant, sale, lease, loan, or otherwise, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this act."

SEC. 6. Section 13 (a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to facilitate any international scientific activities consistent with the purposes of this act and to expend for such international scientific activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable. The Director, with the approval of the Board, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act. In this connection, with the approval of the Secretary of State, the Foundation may undertake programs granting scholarships and fellowships to, or making other similar arrangements with, foreign nationals for scientific study or scientific work in the United States or foreign countries without regard to section 10 or the affidavit of allegiance to the United States required by section 15 (d) (2) of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 13 (b) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting in lieu thereof a new section 13 (b) as follows:

"(b) The Foundation is also authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to undertake programs providing for the conduct or facilitation of such other scientific activities abroad as are deemed to be in the interest of the United States."

SEC. 8. Section 13 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by renumbering former section 13 (b) to become section 13 (c) and by amending section 13 (c) (1) to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c), and the authority to facilitate international scientific activities as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, shall be exercised only with the approval of the Secretary of State, to the end that authority to undertake such programs shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

"(2) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 3268 and insert the provisions of

the bill H. R. 11257 as amended by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 11257) was laid on the table.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11668) to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$3,750,000."

Page 2, line 2, after "amended," insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as may be necessary to replace the sums deposited by him pursuant to this subsection."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because there is entire accord in this legislation on this side, does the gentleman from Arkansas wish to make any further statement?

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad briefly to explain to the House that the purpose of the legislation, as amended, would be to transfer funds from the proceeds of liquidated vested assets under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General into the War Claims Fund in order to satisfy unpaid awards heretofore made under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended. The House passed the bill transferring a total of \$5 million. The Senate reduced that amount to \$3,750,000.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H. R. 11668 providing for the transfer of \$3,750,000 to the War Claims Fund to pay remaining awards by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to Philippine religious organizations for their schools, hospitals, and welfare establishments accomplishes the ends of equity and justice and marks another milestone in the course of friendly Philippine relations.

Under the provisions of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, religious institutions received inadequate consideration because of the age of their equipment and the standards of depreciation used in the payment of claims. Accordingly, Public Law 303 of the 82d Con-

gress was adopted to provide for reimbursement for relief given by these institutions to American soldiers and civilians and to pay for loss and damage of hospitals, schools, leper colonies, and welfare installations on the basis of replacement cost.

When we found that a narrow interpretation of the words "affiliated with organizations in the United States" imposed a hardship on some worthy institutions, we amended the War Claims Act further by Public Law 997 of the 84th Congress to include them. Payments under these Congressional enactments were not met by the taxpayers' money but from the War Claims Fund made up of liquidated enemy assets in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. When the Attorney General required legislation to authorize further transfers to the War Claims Fund to make payments, we first passed Public Law 211 of the 83d Congress and now H. R. 11668 to discharge a number of effective but unpaid additional awards.

There never has been any question about the merit of the provisions for payments to institutions which for generations looked after the education, health, and welfare of the inhabitants of the Philippines in the absence of adequate government maintenance of these services. The unselfish and dedicated activities of religious organizations furthered civilization in those far-off islands and built up a citizenry schooled in democratic ideals and practices. When the growing clouds of communism threatened to obscure the sun of freedom in the newly organized Republic, these resources of western democratic ideals furnished the strength to weather the storm and account for our one remaining bulwark in the Far East against the continuing Communist menace.

No racial, religious, or economic distinctions were drawn among the beneficiaries of our legislation. Although the Filipinos are Christians leaning predominantly to the Roman Catholic faith, nevertheless approximately 30 Protestant institutions have or will have received under the laws enacted by this Congress a total of upward of \$4 million. The Jewish community has been substantially compensated in accordance with their number.

It is no sign of immodesty for us to take deep satisfaction from our accomplishment towards at least partial reimbursement and compensation for the war losses of our Philippine allies and our recognition of the noble works in the field of education, sanitation, health, and welfare of Philippine religious institutions of all faiths and denominations.

CLAIMS PAID

ROMAN CATHOLIC

The Roman Catholic Bishop of Lingayen.....	\$79,839.71
Institute of the Daughters of Jesus.....	53,129.56
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Leyte.....	75,063.56
Immaculate Conception Anglo-Chinese Academy..	30,734.37
Cong. de Religiosas Dominicas de Sta. Cat. de Sena...	622,780.75
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.....	1,245,323.30

CLAIMS PAID—Continued
ROMAN CATHOLIC—continued

Hospital de San Juan de Dios.....	\$931,921.12
Community of the Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres.....	1,250,263.23
The Roman Catholic Bishop of San Fernando.....	6,773.32
Cong. de Religiosas Misioneras de Santo Domingo.....	134,423.83
Congregation of the Religious of the Virgin Mary.....	684,646.03
Franciscan Sisters of the Immaculate Conception.....	39,919.39
Instituto de Hermanas Agustinas Terclarias de Filipinas.....	108,880.06
Roman Catholic Prelature "Nullius" of Iba.....	28,322.62
Beaterio del Santisimo Rosario.....	137,663.15
Foreign Mission Sisters of St. Dominic, Inc.....	194,174.64
For. Mis. Sisters of St. Dominic (St. Paul's Hosp.).....	1,315,523.15
Madres Siervas del Espiritu Santo de la Ador, Perpetua.....	500.00
Corporacion de PP Augustinos.....	1,113,774.30
Society of St. Columban.....	107,551.91
Sisters of the Good Shepherd.....	304,789.55
Community of Benedictine Sisters.....	803,605.68
Servants of the Holy Ghost.....	161,790.33
Maison de la Salle College.....	304,469.02
Christian Brothers.....	148,998.92
Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul.....	1,667,507.07
Society of the Divine Word.....	518,798.38
Assumption Convent, Inc.....	554,038.61
Ateneo de Cagayan.....	482,559.18
Missionary Canonesses of St. Augustine.....	1,033,597.81
Franciscan Missionaries of Mary.....	204,960.83
The Belgian Catholic Missionaries.....	60,179.54
Ateneo de Manila.....	1,954,860.95
Colegio de San Jose.....	331,418.22
Isabelle Cultural Corporation.....	935,229.10
Corp. de Padres Dominicos de Fil. and Univ. of Sto. Tomas.....	1,292,575.12
San Beda College.....	73,979.60
Knights of Columbus.....	115,874.55
Catholic Vicar Apostolic of Mt. Province.....	287,667.64
El Colegio de San Juan de Letran.....	583,016.54
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cagayan.....	205,541.23
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Zamboanga.....	391,500.75
El Observatorio de Manila.....	365,324.98
Ateneo de Naga.....	73,882.07
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Jaro.....	455,825.59
Corp. de Padres Dominicos de Filipinas.....	109,726.70
Congregation of Mission of St. Vincent de Paul.....	229,581.93
Oblates of Mary Immaculate.....	8,814.37
Total.....	21,821,322.27
PROTESTANT	
Hog Baptist Church.....	\$20,362.01
Seaside Baptist Church.....	3,371.00
Cosmopolitan Student Church.....	36,912.98
Domestic and Foreign Mission Society of Protestant Episcopalians.....	218,277.91
St. Luke's Hospital.....	20,908.32
Mary Johnston Hospital.....	12,482.50
Young Men's Christian Association of the Philippines.....	637,723.43

CIV—1184

CLAIMS PAID—Continued
PROTESTANT—continued

General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists.....	\$384,816.98
Young Women's Christian Association of Manila.....	24,892.40
Bishop Mission District of Protestant Episcopal Church in United States of America.....	227,926.14
Silliman University and Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America.....	365,860.43
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America.....	57,558.31
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America.....	5,363.46
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America.....	297,740.34
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.....	139,910.62
American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.....	589,191.00
St. Stephen's Chinese Girl's School.....	23,275.11
Woman's Division of Christian Service of Board of Foreign Missions and Church Extension Methodist Church.....	440,478.32
Board of Foreign Missions of Presbyterian Church in United States of America.....	30,477.82
Central Philippine College.....	105,408.50
Philippine Union Mission Corp. of Seventh Day Adventists.....	25,121.92
	3,668,059.50
(In addition, there have been in claims and paid total amount of \$2,332.50 to some individuals.)	
JEWISH	
National Jewish Welfare Board.....	\$95,147.26
Jewish Community of the Philippines.....	17,982.32
	113,129.58
UNPAID CLAIMS	
ROMAN CATHOLIC	
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cebu.....	\$372,318.19
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Lipa.....	556,675.59
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Surigao.....	131,019.68
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Nueva Caceres.....	215,658.95
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Nueva Segovia.....	300,485.52
La Provincia de San Nicolas de Tolentino de las Islas Filipinas de la Orden de Padres Agustinos Recoletos.....	153,609.17
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Tuguegarao.....	270,891.92
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Lucena.....	208,213.19
Catholic Women's League of the Philippines, Inc.....	21,480.00
Agustinian Recollect Missionaries of the Philippines.....	47,523.91
Colegio de Santa Rosa de Manila, Inc.....	530,767.31
	2,808,643.43
PROTESTANT	
Nabulao Baptist Church.....	\$3,025.00
Union Theological Seminary.....	56,313.52
The Church of Jesus Christ "New Jerusalem".....	810.00

UNPAID CLAIMS—Continued
PROTESTANT—Continued

Philippine Annual Conference of Methodist Church.....	\$200,000.00
Northwest Philippines Annual Conference of the Methodist Church.....	42,500.00
Northern Philippines Annual Conference of Methodist Church.....	57,500.00
Union Church of Manila.....	27,500.00
Philippine Mission Churches of Christ.....	5,000.00
Hinoba-an Baptist Church.....	1,485.00
Dinalupihan Methodist Church.....	525.00
	394,658.52

MANILA.

Congressman McCORMACK,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
The Philippine Baptist Convention and the United Church of Christ in the Philippines send their deep gratitude for your third amendment to the War Claims Act.
ALFREDO R. GOMEZ,
Authorized Representative.

Congressman McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Philippine Federation of Christian Churches passed resolution thanking you for passage third amendment War Claims Act in House of Representatives.
ALFREDO GOMEZ,
Resolution Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, MACK of Illinois, WOLVERTON, and BENNETT of Michigan.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4169) to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization. I may say that this is identical with the bill we had on the Consent Calendar Monday, H. R. 13354.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 10, 1938, c. 335, 52 Stat. 640 (22 U. S. C. 253a) is amended to read as follows: "That the Attorney General is authorized to accept and maintain, on behalf of the United States, membership in the International Criminal Police Organization, and to designate any departments and agencies which may participate in the United States representation with that organization. Each participating department and agency is authorized to pay its pro rata share, as determined by the Attorney General, of the expenses of such membership. The total dues to be paid for the membership of the United States shall not exceed \$25,000 per annum."

Passed the Senate August 18 (legislative day, August 16), 1958.

Attest:

Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "the sum of \$3,200.84," and insert "such sum, not exceeding \$3,200.84, as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may accept as allowable costs payable under contract H-76 or under any amendment thereto had such contract provided for an estimated total cost of \$33,700.84."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the Southwest Research Institute?

Mr. LANE. The Southwest Research Institute is in San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. GROSS. What does it research?

Mr. LANE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the author of the bill, is here, and he will explain it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS, U. S. A., NATIONAL MEMORIAL, INC.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 109) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans,

U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the following-named persons, to wit: Ben Kaufman, Trenton, N. J.; William Berman, Westbrook, Maine; Joseph Gillman, Manchester, N. H.; Captain Louis H. Albrand, Burlington, Vt.; Mrs. Ethel Cohen, Providence, R. I.; Paul J. Robin, Providence, R. I.; Frederick S. Harris, Meriden, Conn.; Edward Lettick, New Haven, Conn.; William Carmen, Brookline, Mass.; David Lasker, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Sarah Stone, Brighton, Mass.; Harry D. Henshel, New York, N. Y.; Captain Joshua Goldberg, New York, N. Y.; Sol Masch, New York, N. Y.; Sam Slutsky, Peekskill, N. Y.; I. T. Rockman, Harrisburg, Pa.; Harry H. Schaffer, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Doctor David Coyne, Hoboken, N. J.; Edward Nappen, Atlantic City, N. J.; Howard M. Berg, Wilmington, Del.; Samuel Michaelson, Baltimore, Md.; Louis E. Spiegler, Washington, D. C.; Joseph F. Barr, Washington, D. C.; Joseph A. Reshefsky, Portsmouth, Va.; Edward Leyton, High Point, N. C.; Doctor Harry Appel, Charleston, S. C.; Harry Harrison, Atlanta, Ga.; Paul Ginsberg, Atlanta, Ga.; Harry Cohen, Miami Beach, Fla.; Louis B. Lepp, Birmingham, Ala.; Edwin I. Baer, Louisville, Ky.; Doctor Yale Burke, South Bend, Ind.; Harry T. Madison, Oak Park, Mich.; William Bobier, Phoenix, Ariz.; Samuel Shaikewitz, St. Louis, Mo.; Major General Julius Klein, Chicago, Ill.; Nathan Rakita, Milwaukee, Wis.; Meyer Dorfman, St. Paul, Minn.; Hyman Greenspan, Dallas, Tex.; Harold Freeman, Phoenix, Ariz.; Harry Pells, Denver, Colo.; Hy Wetzman, San Bernardino, Calif.; Don Kapner, Seattle, Wash.; Sherman Z. Lipstein, Omaha, Nebr.; William Stern, Fargo, N. Dak.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a nonprofit body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Jewish War Veterans, United States of America, National Memorial, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

"COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

"PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTS OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 3. The principles and objects of the corporation shall be—

"(a) to maintain and conduct a national memorial and museum dedicated to and commemorating the service and sacrifice in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period of war by Americans of the Jewish faith;

"(b) to gather, collate, edit, publish, and exhibit the memorabilia, data, records, military awards, decorations, citations, and so forth, for the purpose of preserving the memories and records of patriotic service performed by men and women of the Jewish faith while in the armed services of the United States in time of war; and

"(c) to stimulate patriotism in the minds of all Americans by encouraging the study of the military and naval history of our Nation.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

"(a) to have succession by its corporate name;

"(b) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

"(c) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

"(d) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs; said constitution and bylaws should likewise not be inconsistent with the laws of any State in which the corporation is to operate;

"(e) to contract and be contracted with;

"(f) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

"(g) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property; and

"(h) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws.

"PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

"SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Washington, D. C., but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

"(b) The corporation shall at all times maintain in its headquarters in the District of Columbia a designated agent to accept service of process for the corporation and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the headquarters of the organization in the said District of Columbia shall be deemed notice or service upon the said corporation.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 6. (a) Upon the enactment of this act, the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present officers and members of the board of directors of the existing corporation, entitled "Jewish War Veterans U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.," an organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall be of such number (not less than 36) who shall be selected in such manner, including the filling of vacancies and serve such terms as shall be prescribed under the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

"(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall, during the intervals between corporation meetings, be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation. The board shall be responsible for all finances of the corporation.

"OFFICERS, ELECTION OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 7. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a president and such number of vice presidents as shall be provided for in the constitution and bylaws, as well as a secretary and treasurer.

"(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms as well as with such duties as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

"USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES"

"SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any officer or director or be distributable to any such person. Nothing in this section, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to the officers or employees of the corporation in amounts approved by the executive committee of the corporation.

"(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

"NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION"

"SEC. 9. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

"LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS"

"SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

"PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS"

"SEC. 11. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

"BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION"

"SEC. 12. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

"AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS"

"SEC. 13. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually, at the end of the fiscal year established by the corporation, by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than 6 months following the close of such fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

"USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION"

"SEC. 14. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accord-

ance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto. Nothing in this section shall be construed so as to permit any such assets being distributed to any officer or employee or inuring to the benefit of any private person.

"TRANSFER OF ASSETS"

"SEC. 15. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc., a body corporate organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such corporation and upon complying with all the laws of the District of Columbia applicable thereto.

"RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER"

"SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POFF. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman will explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. LANE. Yes, I will be glad to.

This is for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the understanding we now have with the Senate Committee on the Judiciary as to the form of these corporate charters. This includes a provision that the corporation must not support any political party, that the income may not be distributed to the directors or officers, and that no loans may be made to any of the officers, directors, or employees. It is thought that these are all desirable amendments. The Committee on the Judiciary is now making a practice of putting these requirements into all the various charter bills.

Mr. POFF. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUERDON PLUMLEY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1801) for the relief of Guerdon Plumley.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Guerdon Plumley, Richmond Hill, N. Y., the sum of \$542.50. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Guerdon Plumley was held liable to Abraham Appelbaum in a civil court action in the courts of the State of New York. This civil action arose out of an accident which occurred on April 1, 1951, between an automobile owned by the said Abraham Appelbaum and

a United States mail truck driven by the said Guerdon Plumley, a garageman-driver in the New York post office motor vehicles service. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that Guerdon Plumley shall use such sum or so much thereof as is necessary to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SGT. ROBERT A. ESPE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1258) for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe. Two similar House bills were passed in the various Congresses. This bill has now passed the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Espe, master sergeant, United States Air Force, the sum of \$10,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert A. Espe against the United States on account of the death of his wife, Joyce Merlyn Espe, and his infant son, Victor Robert Espe, on January 26, 1950, while passengers in an Air Force plane which disappeared after leaving Elmendorf Air Base at Anchorage, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES—NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12212) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy. This bill was on the consent calendar earlier this week and was objected to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] who has now withdrawn his objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any employee of the Department of the Navy who, as a result of administrative error, received any overpayment of per diem while assigned to duty at the Golcuk Navy Yard, Ismet, Turkey, during the period beginning November 23, 1955, and ending April 30, 1957, both dates inclusive, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount of such overpayment. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each employee of the Department of the Navy referred to in the first section of this act the amount certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Secretary of the Navy as the total of the amounts withheld from such employee by the United States on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this act, plus the amounts paid to the United States by such employee on account of such overpayments: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PARAGRAPH (K) OF SECTION 403 OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9521) to amend paragraph (k) of section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to define the term "chemical preservative" as used in such paragraph.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who is chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on this matter for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as amended, is to amend section 403 (k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by providing that the term "chemical preservative" as used in that section, shall not be construed to apply to a raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil bearing or containing a fungicide or fungistat applied after harvest, while such commodity, having been received in a shipping container

which bears labeling declaring the name of such fungicide or fungistat, is held or displayed in accordance with the custom of the trade, out of such shipping container.

The amendment further provides that nothing in this act shall affect any requirement of the laws of any State or Territory. The bill, as amended, is in the nature of a compromise. The fresh fruit and vegetable industry sought an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which would have eliminated altogether both on the retail and wholesale levels the labeling requirement contained in section 403 (k). The Federal Food and Drug Administration and a majority of the State food and drug administrators opposed such a change in the law.

Under the provisions of the compromise the labeling requirement would no longer be applicable to the extent that the raw agricultural commodity is held or displayed out of the shipping container in which such commodity was shipped.

Any labeling or other requirements imposed by State laws or the laws of any Territory remain unaffected by this legislation.

The compromise amendment has the support of the fresh fruit and vegetable industries and is also agreeable to the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said by proponents of H. R. 9521 that section 403 (k) of the food and drug law and other sections dealing with labeling are not safety and health features of the law. Nothing is further from the truth. These sections are the cornerstones of good enforcement. Without adequate and proper labeling proper enforcement is almost completely impossible.

The compromise amendment before Congress today reflects two things, the inability of Congress and of the country to appropriate adequate money for full and complete enforcement of the food and drug laws of this country, a situation which we will one day have cause to regret. Because of inadequate appropriations, the Food and Drug Administration must investigate some 85,000 establishments dealing with food, drugs, and cosmetics around this country with less than 350 inspectors.

The compromise made admits only the inadequacy of this force to properly inspect the establishments with whose inspection they are charged. The amendment as drafted expressly recognizes that the States continue to have the responsibility to inspect retail establishments for food, drug, and cosmetics plants within their borders. It also recognizes that the States will continue to have the right to insist on such labeling requirements as they may deem worthwhile, and adequate action under their police power.

I want it made plain that I participated in this compromise because of the inability of the Food and Drug Administration, with its present meager staff, to enforce labeling requirements of the law as to fresh fruits and vegetables treated with postharvest pesticide chem-

icals. But the compromise in no way weakens the rights of States to act in this field, nor is it in any way establishing a precedent under which other labeling sections of the food and drug law are open to attack.

The proposed amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act would add a further provision to section 403 (k) which presently requires, among other things, that if a food bears or contains a chemical preservative it must bear labeling stating that fact. The amendment states that that provision "shall not be construed to apply to a raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil bearing or containing a fungicide or fungistat applied after harvest while such commodity having been received in a shipping container which bears labeling on such container declaring the name and function of such fungicide or fungistat is held or displayed in accordance with the custom of the trade out of such shipping container."

The Food and Drug Administration has contended that substances added to food to retard spoilage through fungicidal or fungistatic activity are chemical preservatives within the meaning of section 403 (k). Therefore commodities which bear such substances when shipped in interstate commerce must comply with those sections of the law that require them to bear labeling stating the fact that preservatives are present and, further, setting forth the names of the chemicals. Present law also requires that this information be displayed at the time of retail sale whether the commodity is offered in bulk or in a prepackaged container. Exemptions from these requirements may be secured upon the showing that it is impracticable to comply with them. There has not been complete agreement between the Food and Drug Administration and industry on whether it is impracticable to declare this information as presently required by law. Neither does industry agree with the Food and Drug Administration that pesticide chemicals are chemical preservatives within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Industry, through H. R. 9521 as originally introduced, has sought a complete exemption from the requirements of section 403 (k) with respect to the declaration of pesticide chemicals on the labeling of fruits and vegetables to which they may have been applied.

It must be borne in mind that many pesticide chemicals are poisonous and deleterious substances which can be used safely only in certain amounts. Safe tolerances are established by law. Therefore it would be unrealistic to enact legislation which would tend to make difficult the task of a regulatory agency charged with the protection of public health by making certain that these dangerous substances are present only in amounts which can be tolerated safely. It would be virtually impossible for the Food and Drug Administration to ascertain, in a timely manner, whether a commodity bears or contains a pesticide chemical and if so the identity of that pesticide chemical—or combination if

two or more are used—unless it is truthfully labeled.

Proper labeling of containers in which fruits or vegetables are shipped at wholesale to show the presence and identity of pesticide chemicals does not appear to present problems which cannot readily be solved by that industry.

The suggested revision would have the following effect:

First. The labeling of shipping containers and of prepackaged raw agricultural commodities which are produce of the soil—for practical purposes, fruits and vegetables—bearing or containing fungicides or fungistats applied post-harvest would have to state the name and function of such fungicides or fungistats. This would facilitate the enforcement responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration in making certain that any pesticide chemicals present are there only in the legally tolerated amounts.

Second. In prepackaged commodities it would make the information relative to the presence of fungicides or fungistats available to consumers in more informative fashion.

Third. It would not make it a Federal offense for a retailer to fail to display labeling on bulk displays of fruits and vegetables in those cases where they bear or contain fungicides or fungistats. In this regard it is important to note that the Federal Government lacks the facilities to enforce any requirement relating to the labeling of retail bulk displays of fruits and vegetables. Therefore, for practical purposes the present requirement is unenforceable. Traditionally, regulation of the local retail sale of fresh fruits and vegetables has been a function of the individual State governments. The present amendment in no way abridges or proscribes the right of the States to impose any requirements relative to the labeling of fruits and vegetables sold at retail which in their opinion is indicated.

In summary, the amendment would preserve the most important safety features of the present law and at the same time offer the relief sought by industry. It would not prevent those States which believe that the presence of pesticide chemicals should be declared in the labeling of bulk retail displays from enacting and enforcing such requirements; to the contrary, it would aid them in this respect.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side of the aisle. In fact, there is considerable desire for the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (k) of section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 343 (k)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "As used in this paragraph the term 'chemical preservative' shall not include any pesticide chemicals when used in or on any raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "adding" strike out all down to and including line 9, and insert: "before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following proviso: 'Provided further, That the provisions of this paragraph relating to chemical preservatives shall not be construed to apply to a raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil, bearing or containing a fungicide or fungistat applied after harvest, while such commodity, having been received in a shipping container which bears labeling on such container declaring the name and function of such fungicide or fungistat, is held or displayed, in accordance with the custom of the trade, out of such shipping container.'"

"(b) Nothing in the amendment made by the first section of this act shall affect any requirement of the laws of any State or Territory."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9521 is of fundamental importance to the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, to the retail trade handling fresh produce, and to consumers.

I want to state at the outset that the question of safety or health is not involved in this legislation inasmuch as these factors are effectively covered in the Miller amendment, section 408, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In fact, Mr. John L. Harvey, Deputy Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, during hearings on the bill, agreed that the whole question of the safety of chemicals used in connection with raw agricultural commodities is dealt with in the Miller amendment. He further stated that there is no question but they are harmless in the quantities used.

The basic objective of this bill is to bring about a workable application of the Miller pesticide-chemical amendment and the rodenticide provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to the marketing and labeling of fresh fruits and vegetables bearing residues of certain pesticide chemicals. The bill makes clear that harmless residues of pesticides which have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration, on fresh fruits and vegetables, are not chemical preservatives within the meaning of section 403 (k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and, therefore, are not subject to the labeling requirements of that section.

It is to be noted that section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act pertains to labeling. Section 403 provides:

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded (k) if it bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless it bears labeling stating that fact: *Provided*, That, to the extent that compliance with the requirement of this paragraph is impracticable, exemptions shall

be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

Since section 403 (k) is only concerned with labeling and not with public health, to apply this labeling requirement to fresh fruits and vegetables makes it unworkable, impractical to enforce, and will not inform the consumer as intended. In addition, the enforcement of this impractical regulation would add to the consumer price of basic food items.

It has been clearly established that the use of pesticide chemicals is most important in providing an adequate supply of foodstuffs in our modern society. It will be recalled that a few years ago if you picked out a nice apple at your favorite store, you were apt to find a very healthy worm within the apple or there might have been insects around the core. But today, thanks to the use of pesticide chemicals, you may safely bite into an apple without fear of the added flavor of a worm or other insects.

On July 22, 1958, the distinguished junior Senator of New York had inserted in the Record an address made by the noted Dr. Bernard L. Oser, of the Food and Drug Research Laboratories, Inc., Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., on the occasion of his receiving the Babcock-Hart award for his valuable contributions to the technology of food production and processing. Dr. Oser pointed out that the science of chemistry is our greatest ally and that it is impossible to calculate precisely the value of agricultural produce saved by pesticides alone. Here it should be noted that, during hearings on this bill, ample evidence was presented that substantiates Dr. Oser's remarks and clearly establishes the need for the use of these pesticide chemicals in connection with the storage and marketing of raw agricultural commodities. In his address, Dr. Oser also warned the American people against popular writings on the subject of chemicals, stating that most of it is fabricated from speculation, half-truths, and obsolete information which, in turn, results in emotional pressure being brought to bear on legislative representatives and administrative agencies. We have witnessed that sort of campaign being waged against this measure.

In order to explain the problems involved in the marketing of raw agricultural commodities, and to show the need for the use of pesticide chemicals and the impracticability of the labeling requirement, I want to point out that the producing areas of fresh fruits and vegetables are located a long distance from the population centers for the most part. As a result, even though the industry has developed an efficient method of marketing, there is still a time lag between the harvesting date and the date of the consumer purchase. For example, after the produce is harvested, some may go into storage, some may be shipped directly to a distribution point, such as Philadelphia, where a chain grocery store repacks it and distributes it to their several stores, and other produce may be shipped to one of the large cities where it is sold at auction, then distributed to many retail outlets. Therefore, unless some

method is used to protect the produce from such things as blue mold, stem-end rot, and decay, the losses will greatly reduce the availability of eatable fresh fruits and vegetables. Hence, it is readily apparent that pesticides play an important part in insuring an adequate supply of these commodities, by retarding development of extraneous spores and inhibiting insect infestation upon the exterior of the produce.

From the foregoing it can also be seen that it is simply impractical to label raw agricultural commodities in a manner which will comply with the food and drug regulations. In any city, fresh fruits and vegetables are supplied by numerous shippers throughout the country. Assume that 3 different supplies of an item have been shipped from 3 different parts of the country and it was necessary to treat these different supplies with different pesticides. In order for the industry to comply with the labeling regulation, each of these three different supplies would have to be kept separate from packinghouse to the distribution point, and to the retail store as well as while they are displayed for retail sale. This would mean a duplication of effort, increased handling, and increased package cost, all adding up to increased cost to the consumer.

Wherever and whenever the law requires added cost, that cost is passed on to the consumer. Further, without the use of pesticides the supply of fresh fruits and vegetables would be greatly reduced, hence the price to the consumer would be prohibitive.

You might say, but that would not be difficult if the boxes were labeled or placards inserted in the boxes to show that the produce has been treated with a certain pesticide. Even so, the produce still would be mixed and commingling would continue, thus making it impossible to comply with the law. This commingling means that the consumer is not informed as the present law in theory implies.

It should be noted that it is a violation of the statute and a criminal offense to place an incorrect label upon the shipment or upon a display in a retail store. Consequently, because of the mixing of produce which unavoidably occurs in the plant where the produce is packaged, at the distribution point, and at the retail store, there are admittedly thousands of technical violations of the statute. This places all concerned in jeopardy of criminal prosecution.

The Food and Drug officials have stated that this requirement is necessary to provide them with information necessary to enforce the provisions of the Food and Drug Act. They added that they do not have sufficient men to adequately police the industry. They have admitted that their only chance of properly enforcing the Food and Drug Act is by policing the shipping points—or the points of origin. Consequently, the argument that the labeling requirement is necessary for the enforcement of the act is clearly without basis in fact.

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that there are up to 150 chemicals involved in this legislation. Such statements are erroneous and without foundation. The regulations promulgated by the Food

and Drug Administration only apply to postharvest pesticide chemicals and there are only about 10 pesticide chemicals presently involved in the labeling requirements of section 403 (k) as it applies to fresh fruits and vegetables.

These postharvest fungicides constitute a small percentage of the pesticide chemicals used in the production, storage and transportation of raw agricultural commodities. As George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, testified on January 11, 1958, before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, "Over 150 pesticide chemicals are used in one way or another on farm crops. About 1,500 separate tolerances have been established to show at what levels these chemicals may safely remain on crops as they are shipped." Therefore, since the Food and Drug Administration has only required the labeling of produce to show the postharvest use of pesticide chemicals, and that when these same chemicals are used before harvest they do not require labeling, H. R. 9521 is only concerned with about 7 percent of the pesticide chemicals used in connection with the production, storage, and marketing of farm crops.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the health and safety factors are adequately covered in the Miller amendment, section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and since the present labeling requirements are totally impractical and do not inform the consumer as intended, I strongly urge enactment of H. R. 9521 to clarify the present statute and to afford relief from the impractical labeling requirement as it pertains to raw agricultural commodities.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been rather close during the last few weeks to the legislation now before the House for consideration. During the last few weeks, a number of us have been working assiduously to formulate a sound compromise between the fruit and vegetable industry and the Food and Drug Administration. I think that H. R. 9521 as amended incorporates such a sound compromise and I believe it is worthy of the full support of the House.

At this time I want to commend the sincere and dedicated efforts of all those who have been involved in our discussions. In particular I wish to commend my good friend, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, and the author of H. R. 9521, Congressman JAMES HALEY, of Florida.

The solution which H. R. 9521 presents to the House today is a workable one. It relieves both the industry and the Food and Drug Administration of the responsibility of enforcing what is an almost impossible labeling requirement at the retail level. At the same time it provides for the specific labeling of shipping containers and thus, in my opinion, will be

of great assistance to the Food and Drug Administration in the enforcement of its program.

The compromise language which has the support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce requires that the label of the container in which fruit and vegetables are shipped declare not only the function of the fungicide or fungistat present but the name as well. I wish to point out that 403 (k) as it now reads does not necessitate the naming of the applied fungicide or fungistat. I think it important to note that by agreeing to the naming of the chemical applied, I do not believe that there is any intention of suggesting that the labeling requirements set forth in section 403 (i) (2) of the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are applicable to fresh fruits and vegetables. This section which pertains to fabricated foods has no relevance to fresh fruits and vegetables. Both the legislative history as well as litigation in the courts clearly indicates that the requirements set forth in 403 (i) (2) are inapplicable to fresh produce.

Testimony presented by the Food and Drug Administration at hearings held on H. R. 9521 seems to indicate, however, that the Food and Drug Administration believes that section 403 (i) (2) is in some way relevant. As I understand it, the Administration contends that when DDT is applied to an apple, that apple then becomes a fabricated food because the apple is one ingredient and the DDT is another ingredient.

The Supreme Court in *American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brodlex Company* (283 U. S. 1) has effectively ruled on this contention. In that case which involved the application of borax to oranges, the Court pointed out that:

Addition of borax to the rind of natural fruit does not produce from the raw material an article for use which possesses a new or distinctive form, quality, or property. The added substance only protects the natural article against deterioration by inhibiting development of extraneous spores upon the rind. There is no change in the name, appearance, or general character of the fruit. It remains a fresh orange fit only for the same beneficial uses as theretofore.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem therefore most unlikely that any inference could be drawn from the amendment which has been accepted by the supporters of H. R. 9521 as to the applicability of the labeling requirement set forth in section 403 (i) (2) for fruits and vegetables. Clearly such inference would be unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to commend the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for their diligent efforts on behalf of H. R. 9521. I know that my esteemed colleague, Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, who effectively represents the fresh fruit and vegetable producers of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon wants to join with me in this commendation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend paragraph (k) of section 403

of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 651 was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CLUBS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS ESPECIALLY INTERESTED IN SCIENCE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13191) to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; how much is this bill going to cost?

Mr. WRIGHT. The authorization is limited to not more than \$50,000 annually.

Mr. GROSS. That is \$50,000 annually?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. How many clubs will there be? Is this nationwide? What is it?

Mr. WRIGHT. It directs the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to start the organization of future scientists clubs similar to the Future Farmers of America clubs throughout the country.

It was reported by the committee unanimously with 20 Members present.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would withdraw this bill. There are several matters I would like to ask about and which I think should be discussed. Is this a foot-in-the-door proposition that is going to grow and grow into a large expenditure?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that it is not a foot in the door any more than the Future Farmers of America was.

Mr. GROSS. How much money did we expend on the Future Farmers of America?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think about the same. This bill was patterned after the bill creating the Future Farmers of America.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any additional cost as far as the Future Farmers of America were concerned?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not think there was.

Mr. GROSS. This would cost how much? I do not want to start something that is going to be a drain on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman that this bill met with the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our committee considered it and considered that it was a good thing.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman expect to be back here for another \$50,000 next year?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not expect to be back at all.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I be-

lieve that too many bills are being called up and passed in this manner at this late hour. I shall have to ask the gentleman to withdraw his request. I shall object to any further bills tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am asking the gentleman to withdraw his request, or I shall regrettably have to object.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to say he was going to object to every consent request for the balance of the day?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me a great amount of business is going through the House without due consideration. I shall listen carefully to each request as it is presented.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has asked the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. I comply with the request, Mr. Speaker.

ADMINISTRATIVE SITE FOR YOSEMITE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the extraordinary natural qualities of Yosemite National Park, notwithstanding its increasing use by the public, the Secretary is hereby authorized to provide in the manner hereinafter set forth an administrative site in the El Portal area adjacent to Yosemite National Park, in order that utilities, facilities, and services required in the operation and administration of Yosemite National Park may be located on such site outside the park.

Sec. 2. For said site the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase or donation, or with donated funds, approximately 1,200 acres, as shown on map No. NP-YOS-7011, of non-Federal land, interests in land, and appurtenances thereto, and, to avoid severing parcels in private ownership which extend beyond the area so depicted, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire in their entirety such parcels of land or interests therein.

Sec. 3. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are authorized to arrange and effect mutually satisfactory transfers of jurisdiction over land administered by each in the El Portal area. Land so transferred to the Secretary of the Interior shall thereupon be excluded from the national forest or forests involved and thereafter be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this act as a part of said administrative site. Land transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to this act shall thereupon become national forest land subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to land acquired pursuant to the Weeks law.

Sec. 4. Unless acquired as authorized by this act, nothing contained herein shall, with respect to lands comprising the administrative site, affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral right-of-way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or affect the rights of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

Sec. 5. The administrative site provided for herein shall not become a part of Yosemite National Park, nor shall it, except as hereinafter provided, be subject to the laws and regulations governing said park, but the site shall be subject to such special rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may determine are necessary to assure its administration in accordance with the terms and purposes of this act: *Provided*, That the authority to grant privileges, leases, and permits and to enter into contracts for the accommodation of visitors in the park, as contained in section 3 of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (45 Stat. 235, 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 3), shall apply to this site.

Sec. 6. Funds now or hereafter appropriated or otherwise available for operating and capital programs in the areas administered by the National Park Service, including funds for acquisition of land and interest in land, are hereby made available to acquire land, interests in land, and appurtenances thereto, within the administrative site, and to further the purpose of this act.

Sec. 7. (a) In order to provide compensation for tax losses sustained as a result of any acquisition by the United States, of privately owned lands, together with any improvements thereon, located within said site, payments shall be made to the county in which such lands are located in accordance with the following schedule of payments: For the fiscal year in which the land has been or may be acquired and 9 years thereafter there shall be paid an amount equal to the full amount of annual taxes last assessed and levied on the land, together with any improvements thereon, by public taxing units in such county, less any amount, to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, which may have been paid on account of taxes for any period falling within such fiscal year. For each succeeding fiscal year, until 20 years elapse, there shall be paid on account of such land an amount equal to the full amount of taxes referred to in the preceding sentence, less 5 percent of such full amount for the year for which the payment is to be made and an additional 5 percent for each preceding year which falls within said 20-year period: *Provided*, That the amount payable under the foregoing schedule for any fiscal year preceding the first full fiscal year following the approval of this act shall not become payable until the end of such full fiscal year.

(b) As soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, the amount then due for such fiscal year shall be computed and certified by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That such amount shall not exceed 25 percent of the revenues collected during such fiscal year at Yosemite National Park.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 23, through page 3, line 5, strike out all of the language following the words "Sec. 4." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Nothing herein contained shall affect any valid claim, location, or entry existing under the land laws of the United States, or the rights of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land."

Page 3, line 6, through page 3, line 18, strike out all of the language following the words "Sec. 5." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Until further action by the Congress, the lands acquired by or transferred to the Secretary of the Interior hereunder shall not become a part of Yosemite National Park, nor be subject to the laws and regulations governing said park, but the Secretary of the Interior shall have supervision, management, and control of the area and shall make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for its use and management: *Provided*, That he may grant nonexclusive privileges, leases, and permits for the use of land in the area and enter into contracts relating to the same, subject to the limitations and conditions applying to the similar authority provided in section 3 of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (45 Stat. 235, 16 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 3)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sisk: Page 4, line 17, strike out section 7 in its entirety.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 653) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Wang Fai (Freddie) Chun."

Page 2, line 2, after "Cornell," insert "and."
Page 2, line 3, strike out ", and Kinji House."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "and Kinji House."
Page 2, line 12, after "Act," insert "except in the case of Hermine Keshishyan."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 659) for the relief of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"Sec. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Ignatia (Marie Nicodemia Wilhelmina Kohlmann), Sister Charlotte (Maria J. Matthijssen), Sister Laurentia (Johanna Gertrude Theresia

Smeets), Sister Bernardine (Maria Hendrika Hegeman), Sister Petronella (Johanna Monica Plasmans), and Sister Raymonde (Wilhelmina Grada Weijn) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this section of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 212 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 661) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

Page 2, line 14, strike out "4" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "5" and insert "3."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 635) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, strike out all after line 15 over to and including line 4 on page 3 and insert:

"Sec. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Ramon Rodriguez and Pedro Flores-Carrillo."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 4, line 4, strike out "6" and insert "5."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REFERENCE TO THE LABOR REFORM BILL, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE KENNEDY-IVES BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following statement of the President issued today in reference to the so-called Kennedy-Ives bill:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am most disappointed that the Congress has thus far failed to enact legislation to curb the racketeering, corruption, and abuses of trust and power which Senator McClellan's committee has found to exist today in the labor-management field.

Last January I recommended to Congress that comprehensive legislation be enacted so that the rights of the American worker would be safeguarded. The bill passed by the Senate in June, the so-called Kennedy-Ives bill, fell far short of these recommendations.

For example, it failed to provide adequate machinery to enforce the standards necessary to the proper handling of labor union funds. Further, the bill's failure to deal with the problems of boycotting and black-mail picketing would have given greater impetus to abuses the American people want to curb. It would have weakened certain aspects of the Taft-Hartley Act. It did not move at all toward recognition of appropriate State responsibility in labor matters.

In sum, it did not meet the Nation's needs because it did not deal effectively with many of the evils which need correction.

On August 18 the House voted on the bill under a procedure which permitted no opportunity to amend it and thus to correct its deficiencies.

I still hope that before adjournment the Congress will pass a labor bill which will effectively protect the working men and women of our country.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF PAROLE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4096) to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this new matter?

Mr. LANE. No. This appeared on the Consent Calendar earlier this week.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It has not been considered by the House?

Mr. LANE. No, it has not been considered by the House. It was on the Consent Calendar earlier this week. The gentleman who objected to the bill desires to withdraw his objection. There is no objection to the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman inform us what the bill does?

Mr. LANE. This bill comes to us as an Executive communication and seeks

to increase the salaries of the members of the Board of Parole from \$13,900 to \$17,500, an increase of approximately \$3,500 a year for each one of those members. It seems that in 1956 Congress passed the Federal Executive Pay Raise Act. At that time the 21 boards and commissions all received increases in salaries, but the Board of Parole was not included in the 1956 Federal Executive Pay Act, therefore received no salary increase.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How many members are involved?

Mr. LANE. Eight members. It has the blessing of your Attorney General and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is listed as one of those to be considered under suspension of the rules. I would suggest that the gentleman withdraw it for the time being.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That will be agreeable to me.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the special order I obtained today I be permitted to recognize other members of the Washington delegation and that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, with Mr. HOLMES, the retiring Member, to be last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and at any time during the remainder of this week it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules and pass certain bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what bills are embraced in this request?

Mr. ALBERT. The following bills will be called up under suspension under the unanimous-consent request:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, establish a force for United Nations, with amendments;

S. 3335, National Capital Center of the Performing Arts;

S. 3942, Azores, relief, aliens;

S. 4039, funds for science research;

S. 3653, training school, Immigration, and Naturalization Service;

H. R. 13343, authorization appropriation, Pan American games;

S. 1864, Patent Office, increase board of appeals;

H. R. 7166, technical amendments, Railroad Retirement Tax Act;

S. 2719, fish, salmon, and halibut bounties.

S. 3712, appropriations for Rama Road, Nicaragua;

S. 3379, Foreign Service annuities, with amendment;

S. 3680, participation, World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition;

S. 4096, compensation, Board of Parole;

S. 2114, field sites, National Bureau of Standards;

S. 1438, bonds of United States marshals; and

S. 1985, authorizing plans for National Air Museum.

Mr. Speaker, I will state that these bills have all been cleared with the leadership on the minority side and these bills only are embraced within the unanimous consent request.

Mr. GROSS. These are the only bills; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand that if there are any other bills added to this list, they will be the subject of a further unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am tremendously interested in the bill providing for the increase in retirement pay for railroad workers. That is not on the list the gentleman read, is it?

Mr. ALBERT. That is not.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we owe as much to the railroad employees as we do to anyone else in the United States, if not more. I know the tremendous strain those wonderfully fine men are under. I hope so much that that bill will be brought up.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand this list of 16 bills will be called at any time during the balance of the week, and only these; and that any others that might be placed on such a list will be put there only after consultation with Members on the minority side.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that No. 17 on the old list, H. R. 13241, has been stricken, primarily because of the fact that the subject matter is being taken care of by the conference report on the school bill.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. I will say to the gentleman that the list here is the list agreed to between the Speaker and the minority leadership, and it is the only list that is embraced within my request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give us any idea as to when the first of these suspensions will be called up?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, under the agreement, that will be within the dis-

cretion of the Speaker. I should think the Speaker would probably recognize for suspensions tomorrow. We have other legislative business, however.

Mr. GROSS. Will they be called in the order in which they are listed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will seek to do that, if possible.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ARENDS. If the gentleman will permit, the other business is the completion of the minerals bill, and we have been advised that when these suspensions are called, we will be told in ample time so that we can notify the Members.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—A NEW BATTLEGROUND OF THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 47th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union was held in Rio de Janeiro on July 24 to August 1, 1958. It was my privilege to be a member of the United States delegation to the Conference. This was the first conference of the Interparliamentary Union which I have attended as a delegate. I was impressed with a number of developments which took place in the Conference and equally unimpressed with still another set of developments.

At this point I should like to express my appreciation to our able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, whose keen understanding of the importance of the Interparliamentary Union in these days of strife and international tension contributed largely to the successful work of the American delegation.

I came away from the Conference convinced of one thing; that is, the Interparliamentary Union has become a major battleground for the ideological struggle which we call the cold war. The Interparliamentary Union is an important world forum because it provides a political arena in which the great issues of the day are taken up and debated by parliamentarians from many countries of the world. The Russian imperialists have seized upon this time-honored international forum as a strategic platform from which they are attempting to spread their insidious propaganda, promote the ideology of totalitarianism, and spread the seeds of discord among the non-Communist nations holding membership in the Interparliamentary Union.

It would be a very grave error to underestimate the power of the public platform provided by the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. In these days of rapid, mass communications the spoken word from any world forum is transmitted in many languages to millions of people in all quarters of the globe in a matter of minutes. No

longer are the points of view, opinions, resolutions introduced, and resolutions adopted confined to voluminous printed reports which, after review by a few experts, and scholars, are then filed away to gather dust. The international forum today is a readymade vehicle for the forming of public opinion in every country where the news from abroad is not subject to the straitjacket of censorship and a controlled press, radio, and television. This is particularly true in times of international stress and tension, such as the world finds itself in today.

The Russians are well aware of these facts. They know that the free press, radio, and television will carry their spoken words and proposals at these international forums by virtue of simply reporting fully and accurately on the proceedings of such meetings. They also know that the harsh hand of totalitarian censorship will prevent the full reporting of such events to the people within the present-day Russian empire. Only what the thought control experts of the Kremlin think is good for the people to hear or read will be carried. Thus, the Russian representatives at the Interparliamentary Union or any other international forum have a readymade, one-way street for their ideological warfare activities. That street leads straight to millions of people of the non-Communist world who are anxiously awaiting an era of peace and justice and prosperity for all people.

The American delegation under the chairmanship of our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] had ample opportunity to clarify the position of the United States with respect to many of the great issues of our day. This was a very important part of the work of the mission because the Russian group worked overtime attempting to distort and misrepresent the position of our country in world affairs.

Congresswoman CATHERINE ST. GEORGE was chairman of the committee considering a draft resolution on the non-self-governing territories. In its capacity as well as in all the proceedings of the conference she brought great credit to the United States. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to her, not only for her support, but also for her keen knowledge of the procedural precedents of the Conference in keeping alive and actively before the Interparliamentary Union an important amendment which I offered on behalf of the United States delegation to the draft resolution of non-self-governing territories.

Mr. HENRY TALLE on the opening day of the Conference brought the good wishes of Congress and the American people to the assembled delegates. He pointed up the importance of the Organization of American States in which 21 nations of this hemisphere serve as voluntary, equal partners, characterizing it as the most successful adventure in international community living which the world has ever known. His analysis of the importance of freedom of the press, both national and international, was one of the highlights of the Conference.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, addressing the Conference the second day, made the point that it was impossible to expect one side to abandon nuclear tests until it was positively assured the other side would do likewise. This was in answer to the propagandizing efforts of the Russian group to capitalize on the hollow announcement recently made by the Kremlin on suspension of nuclear tests, immediately after the Russians had completed their most extensive set of nuclear bomb tests to date. She also made it clear that the action which the United States and Great Britain took in Lebanon and Jordan was taken at the request of the legal governments of those countries and in response to solemn promises given that we would help defend the nations of that area against aggression. It was pointed out that the United States and Great Britain were taking nothing from those countries and that they would not murder people to whom safe conduct had been promised. This observation was an appropriate reference to the Russian aggression against Hungary in 1956 and the murder a few months ago of Imre Nagy, who had been promised safe conduct by the Russians.

Mr. SADLAK addressed the Conference on Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories. His theme was "deeds not words" in evaluating the progress toward self-government in these territories. He presented the challenging record of deeds of the United States, underscoring the orderly, historical movement of the Philippines toward national independence. As a consequence a solid bond of confidence and mutual respect exists between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines. In a realistic analysis of the political trends in the area of non-self-governing territories and nations he stated:

Today the non-self-governing areas cannot be told to wait 300 years for freedom to come to them. Many demand it now. Others will soon add their voices to the call for liberty.

Mr. KEATING, in addressing the seventh session of the Conference, did a very able job of analyzing the international fraud perpetrated by the Kremlin in its unilateral declaration to stop the testing of hydrogen bombs. He raised the pertinent questions as to who could place any faith in the promises of the Russians in light of their long record of broken treaties and agreements and why the Russians were unwilling to discuss international inspection to insure that agreements in this vital area were lived up to. His vigorous advocacy of an international police force to prevent aggression by either direct or indirect action exposed the basic reason why the Russians opposed this plan—they feared this force for genuine peace might be called upon to prevent war should another freedom revolution break out within their captive empire, such as occurred in Hungary in 1956.

Mr. FOAGE, speaking at the eighth session of the Conference on Strengthening of Peace, pointed out that at the end of World War II the United States had quickly demobilized 10 million men

whereas the Soviet Union had not demobilized to any comparable extent even 12 years after the end of the war. It was therefore obvious why other nations had rejected the Russian proposal for armaments limitations—they would have no way of knowing whether the Russians were living up to their own international proposals. The fact that the Soviet Union maintained a military establishment larger than all other nations of the world combined was pointed up as a necessary background to evaluating any proposal emanating from them. He concluded that until there was complete and absolute inspection, there could be no effective disarmament.

Mr. BOGGS addressed the ninth session and emphasized that cultural exchanges should have as their objective not co-existence in an atmosphere of fear of atomic war, but genuine understanding in an atmosphere of mutual trust. In acknowledging the effort put forth by the Soviet Union on education of youth he expressed the conviction that an educated people, no matter how indoctrinated, would demand freedom. He predicted that police states were doomed by an educated society.

Members of Congress, I am sure, will be interested in a brief summary of the Russian attempts to use the Conference for false propaganda and derisive purposes, and the tactics they employed.

The attempted uses can be broken down into the following main categories:

First. An effort to have the Conference go on record as branding the United States and Great Britain as military or armed aggressors.

Second. An effort to promote the ideology of communism by the advocacy of nationalization of all basic industries and national resources by the less developed nations of the world.

Third. An effort to cause division and discord among the member states of the Organization of American States.

Fourth. An effort to camouflage the Soviet Union as a peace-loving force made up of happy people anxious to help the less developed nations while impugning the United States, Great Britain, and other free countries as imperialists and exploiters of other nations.

Fifth. An effort to further the illusion that the imposed Communist regimes in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and Central Europe were freely elected and that the so-called parliaments in those countries represented the freely expressed will of the people.

The tactics they used to advance these propaganda objectives were in some instances clever and in others both obvious and crude. Briefly, they were as follows:

The Russian group brought along with them a special message from the Kremlin in the nature of a propaganda resolution. That resolution paid the usual lip service to the cause of peace as a background to inflammatory and false charges against the United States and Great Britain. The clear intent of the resolution was to cause the Conference to brand the United States and Great Britain as armed aggressors in the Near East and the enemies of the national independence movement while casting the

Russian imperialists in the unbecoming role of friend and defender of Arab nationalism. This last-minute Russian resolution was ruled to be out of order because it had not been submitted to the appropriate committee before the date set for the submission of all resolutions. Nevertheless, the Russians and their appointed representatives to their captive non-Russian nations made a great deal of noise about it during several days of the Conference.

In the debate on the investment of foreign capital in countries in process of economic development, the principal Russian spokesman openly advocated the nationalization of all natural resources of raw material, transportation facilities, ports, powerplants, and other basic industries. He charged that unless this was done the investment of foreign capital would not contribute to the development of these nations. In the same context he claimed that nationalization of all means of production in the Communist-occupied countries has led to rapid industrialization and a better life for the people. The facts, however, do not support his claims. It is well known that nationalization within the Russian empire is nothing more than a clever device through which the Russians can more thoroughly exploit the workers in the captive countries, provide a higher standard of living for the new Russian aristocracy and its entourage, all resulting in a miserable existence for the common man. This unhappy result should be well considered by the leaders of the less developed countries who are attempting to close overnight the industrial time gap of a hundred years. In any case, it would be well for Congress to consider putting a prohibition on the use of any United States public funds, that is the money put up by the taxpayers of the United States, for the development of any projects or industries which are nationalized by the country receiving or seeking a loan of such funds. This would put a quick stop to Russian efforts to clamp their worker-exploiter system on free countries, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. The only thing the Russians can contribute to the material advancement of the less developed countries is loose conversation. It is time we called the Russian bluff and forced those who are flirting with these loose promises to take a position for or against nationalization. Sooner or later we will have to face this issue and the sooner we do the better it will be for us and our traditional friends.

No opportunity was lost by the Russian group and their appointed spokesman for the captive non-Russian nations to portray the Soviet Union as a champion of progress, culture, and "peaceful co-existence." Practically every spokesman for the Russian bloc played on these themes, just like the sounds emanating from a cracked phonograph record. All of this was, of course, played into the official record which certainly will be given wide distribution later by the Kremlin. A most unusual performance in this regard was put on when the report of the Commit-

tee on Intellectual Relations came before the Conference. This report was presented in the name of the Committee by one of the Russian group but it turned out to be two reports. One was the Russian report which found everything the Russians are doing to be just dandy and everything wrong in the world to be the fault of the non-Communist nations. All the corny and overworked propaganda themes of the Russians were set forth in this report. The other phase of the report turned out to be nothing more than a reference to the fact that other matters were taken up in the Committee but the Russian chairman attached no importance to them.

If ever I was tempted to feel that cultural exchange programs with the Russians might ease international tensions, my experience at this Conference has removed all possible temptations in the future.

The Russian group made a number of concerted efforts to sow the seeds of discord and division among the members of the Organization of American States. The most obvious and open effort came in the discussions of the economic development of the nonindustrialized nations. The Russian spokesman charged that the capitalist countries were engaging in imperialist activities in preventing the development of many countries of Latin America. Interwoven in his speech of discord was the theme that the Latin American republics should isolate themselves from the system of free enterprise which has brought billions of investment and development dollars to our friends to the south. No responsible American has ever claimed that the capitalist system is perfect but no honest appraisal can support the charge that the investment of American capital in Latin America has not contributed substantially to the industrialization and economic advancement of the countries in that area. Much more needs to be done under a system that will guarantee that the full benefits of the capitalist system, as we know it, will accrue to all the people of the Latin American Republics. The alternative offered by the Russian spokesman is a pernicious form of colonialism much worse than the chains of the old colonialism which the Latin Americans broke many, many years ago.

It seemed to me ridiculous that the Russian group spent so much time fighting a propaganda war against colonialism and imperialism. The most aggressive colonizers and imperialists down through 500 years of history have been the Russians. The outstanding characteristic they possess is that of ruthless colonizer and imperialist. Only a few years ago the world witnessed the depths of their despotism in advancing their dream of world empire when the Imperial Red Army reinvaded Hungary to stamp out the demands of the Hungarian people for freedom and national independence. To hear a Russian rail against colonialism and imperialism was like hearing a thief cry thief. This strange performance may be accounted for in some part by the Russian national psychosis which has caused them to feel

they could never escape from the historic tyranny of their own system unless they saved the world from its encroachments. "Peaceful coexistence" was announced over and over again as the Russian solution to world tensions. This is the plan whereby the non-Communist world is called upon to disarm and put itself at the mercy of the leaders in the Kremlin. No mention was made by the Russians of outlawing the evils of internal subversion or indirect aggression which has been their specialty and which today is an even more dangerous threat to human freedom than armed conflict.

Sitting through the sessions of the Conference and observing the actions of the Russians and their appointed representatives from many of the captive nations of their empire, I could not help but ask myself by what standard of judgment had the Interparliamentary Union admitted them to membership in the organization. Is it not a well-known fact that the Presidium of the Soviet Union is nothing more than a rubber-stamp for the policies and programs already decided by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? Is it not a known fact that the Presidiums of the occupied countries of central and eastern Europe are nothing more than a cheering section for the orders handed down by the Communist Party of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic to their proconsuls in those countries? In no sense can these Presidiums be considered as deliberative bodies. In none is the right to dissent allowed, none is made up of representatives chosen by the will of the people. All are handpicked by the Communist Party and the people are compelled to vote for them because all legitimate political parties are prohibited. It is a fair question to ask whether legitimate parliamentary bodies are not doing violence to the truth and impairing the moral force of representative government by admitting to their councils people who are not parliamentarians by any realistic standards or stretch of the imagination? The danger exists that these corroding influences will weaken the structure of the Interparliamentary Union and bring it to such a state of disrepair that its usefulness which was so long in the building will be lost.

An example of my point is well demonstrated by the fact that K. Gubin, chief editor of the Russian newspaper, *Isvestia*, the ideological organ of the Russian Communist Party, was at the conference posing as a parliamentarian of the U. S. S. R. This professional propagandist played a most important role for the Russian group during the proceedings of the Conference. At the meeting of the committee on representative assemblies in the non-self-governing territories he was the Russian spokesman against the amendment proposed by the United States delegation.

Another case in point is that of J. I. Paleckis, a spokesman for the U. S. S. R., and the Russian representative on the Council of the Interparliamentary Union. He was officially listed by the Russian group as follows: "Deputy of the

Soviet of Nationalities, Deputy President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian S. S. R." He has still another listing and a most pertinent one, in the public hearings conducted by the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. It will be recalled that this select committee was established to inquire into the Russian military occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the forced incorporation of those once free and independent countries into the Soviet Union in 1940. The select committee took sworn testimony from eyewitnesses to this tragedy. One of these witnesses was Gen. Jonas Cernius, who had been Prime Minister of Lithuania in 1939. He testified to the ultimatum the Soviet Union handed to the Lithuanian Government which forced them to reorganize their government, and establish a provisional government. This so-called provisional government was established with the Red army in occupation of Lithuania. This excerpt from the sworn testimony shows how that provisional government was formed and how Paleckis became President:

Mr. McTIGUE. The provisional government? General CERNIUS. Yes.

I was invited to be Minister of Defense by General Rastikis.

I said over the phone that we could do nothing. I was not in Kaunas in those days. He said, "We will try to do everything possible."

There was installed the so-called puppet regime. The regime of Paleckis.

Mr. KERSTEN. He is the Communist puppet? He was at that time?

General CERNIUS. I knew him personally before, in Lithuania. He was sometimes invited to the Embassy of the Soviet Union in Kaunas. He was editor of a newspaper, but he didn't play the role of communism. But it seems he was a Communist.

Mr. KERSTEN. He was a secret Communist, and he is the present Communist dictator there, isn't he?

General CERNIUS. Yes. He was appointed by Russia. It was a disappointment.

Smetona said, "I cannot get people for government; Moscow tells me."

It cannot be argued that since the Russians and their many colonies hold membership in the United Nations they are therefore qualified for membership in the Interparliamentary Union. The United Nations was never intended to be and is not now a parliamentary body. There is need, therefore, for a careful examination of these questions by Members of Congress and the parliamentary bodies of other member nations who are interested in the future of the Interparliamentary Union.

Membership in the Interparliamentary Union brings with it a recognition which should not be overlooked. The newly independent nations of the world are aware of this and they should be welcomed to membership. So, too, are the Russians aware of this fact. They see in Interparliamentary Union membership a golden opportunity to hang a false mantle of legitimacy and respectability over the Communist regime which they have imposed by force and violence upon once free and independent nations. They make a great effort to gain admis-

sion for these regimes and to present their spokesmen as representatives of the people of these unhappy countries. For the past several years the Russians have been attempting to gain admission for Red China. This year the main effort was to gain admission for Outer Mongolia, another appendage of the Russian empire which is currently serving as a convenient exile for the demoted Molotov. Their efforts failed but one can be certain they will try again at future meetings of the Interparliamentary Union.

It is significant to note that every member of the Russian group, including their appointees from the captive countries, charged the United States and Great Britain with actions threatening the peace. This was the main line they parroted in every speech they made. The spokesman for the Yugoslav Communists fully supported the Russians in their efforts to pin the label of armed aggressor on the United States. He skillfully pleaded the case of the Russians asking that the many black lessons of history be forgotten and that the free countries accept things as they are. This was an appeal for recognition of a status quo such as Khrushchev has persistently stated as a condition sine qua non to the convening of another so-called summit conference.

In contrast to this exhibition of speakers with their minds in a strait-jacket, there were many constructive and significant points of view on world problems put forth by the delegates from the free countries. Notable was the address of Madame Ngo Dinh-Nhiv of Vietnam who made a stirring appeal on behalf of the people of the newly independent nations of Asia. She urged the Interparliamentary Union to remain true to its origins—to leave "the role of political compromise and bargaining to the United Nations, in order itself to be essentially the high moral authority, integral depository for the ideal of human liberty."

The delegate from Turkey, Mme. Nazli Tlabar, in another significant address urged the Interparliamentary Union to stick to its principles and leave all compromise to the United Nations. She made the point that "In this nuclear age, I still believe that there is a tremendous power in ideals, more power than in the poor words with which we seek to imprison them."

In connection with a draft resolution on the non-self-governing territories which was pending before the Conference, a careful study of it convinced me it was both incomplete and one-sided. The language of the pending resolution was pointed only at the colonies and non-self-governing territories in the free world, thereby neglecting the most serious problems of colonialism and imperialism, that is, the new colonialism, the new imperialism of the Russian Communists. An opportunity was afforded me to speak before the Conference on this matter, during which I offered an amendment on behalf of the United States delegation to accord equal time and consideration to the problem of the non-self-governing nations of the

Russian Empire. I had reference to Poland, the Baltic States, Hungary, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam and others in a similar colonial position. My proposal was met with enthusiasm by the majority of the delegates attending. As expected, the Russian group did not take kindly to it because it upset their carefully laid plans to use the Conference as a platform for branding the Western nations as imperialists. The only answer they offered to the proposal was a clumsy effort to confuse the issue.

The amendment which I offered was referred to the Juridical Committee where it will be taken up and acted upon at the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Nice, France. In my judgment this development offers an opportunity for the United States delegation and delegations from other free countries to explode the myth which the Russian imperialists have been spreading about the one happy family of socialist nations. Moreover, it provides an opportunity for the Free World to reassure the friendly people of these non-self-governing nations that we are actually working for their peaceful liberation from Russian tyranny and occupation. It would also have the effect of putting the Russians on the defensive on the basic cause of world tensions and strife. This would be a reversal of the climate the Russians have been working in at the Interparliamentary Union Conference. Vigorous support of this amendment and its approval can result in the strengthening of the cause of liberty and freedom, and thereby would be a contribution to the winning of a just and lasting peace.

As I said in my opening remarks, the Russians have moved the ideological war into the Interparliamentary Union. No longer is the Interparliamentary Union restricted to a conference of representatives of legitimate parliamentary bodies. It is now an important battleground of the cold war. The executive branch of the Government has been required to meet the challenge of the cold war in the United Nations and in other international organizations and meetings. Many Members of Congress have not been satisfied that a maximum effort has been made by the Government in these encounters with the ideological warfare of the Russians. The challenge of the cold war has now been thrust directly into the legislative branch of the Government. I say directly because Congress is solely responsible for participation in the Interparliamentary Union just as the executive branch is primarily responsible for actions taken in meetings of heads of government, the United Nations, and in other intergovernmental organizations. Congress must meet this challenge. To meet the challenge, Congress must develop a more definite and positive program for participation in the Interparliamentary Union—a program which will vigorously advocate, first, the principles of individual liberty and human freedom; second, the right of all nations to national self-deter-

mination in an atmosphere free from foreign occupation and control; third, the orderly industrial development of those nations which seek our assistance under a system which will guarantee that a fair share of the benefits therefrom will accrue to the people of those nations; fourth, realistic and workable disarmament programs; fifth, free regional federations of coequal States developed along the lines of the Organization of American States; sixth, the full utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes as a means of lifting the heavy labors from the backs of mankind; seventh, the harnessing of the great scientific discoveries and advances of our age to resolving the problems of disease, famine, and poverty which confront the majority of the people who inhabit the earth.

I will insert a copy of the amendment offered by the United States delegation which I had the honor to present and which is now pending before the Juridical Committee of the Interparliamentary Union. At the interim meeting of the Union next spring, this amendment will be considered and acted upon. The amendment offered by the United States delegation is:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 47TH INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, RIO DE JANEIRO, JULY 24-AUGUST 1, 1958

Point 6 of the Agenda:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLIES IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Amendment submitted by the United States delegation: Insert, after the final paragraph:

"And since it is a matter of equal concern that many once free and independent nations during the past 40 years have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing nations, deprived of their free political institutions and representative parliamentary bodies, thus creating a situation causing widespread strife within such nations, leading to international tensions which might give rise to war;

"Considers that such non-self-governing nations should be given consideration equal to that accorded non-self-governing territories in all proceedings of the Conference."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I commend the gentleman on his initiative, research and presentation he has made in undertaking to give to our colleagues a complete and succinct report on the recent, I would say successful, conference held in Rio de Janeiro. I am intimately familiar with the Conference itself and with the great part the gentleman played in presenting his amendment. The editor of *Izvestia* almost had apoplexy from making every effort to have the matter stricken, but the gentleman succeeded in keeping it alive so that it has gone over to the next meeting, which will be held in Nice.

I am of the same opinion as the gentleman that this is a vitally important conference and that we must do the job completely or else the meetings will be taken over by the Soviets and those satellites whom they are still endeavoring to bring into the Interparliamentary Union, for example, Red China.

I would suggest that the gentleman, in order to make this a complete compendium of the activities of our delegation that went to Rio de Janeiro, ask unanimous consent that those speeches of our colleagues who likewise participated be entered in the *Record*, and any additional comments they may desire to make.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman very much, and also thank him for the suggestion. I am mindful of the noteworthy and successful efforts made by our colleague from Connecticut during all the sessions of the Conference in winning new friends for the United States and in clarifying the position of the United States on important world issues. He was tireless in his endeavors and a worthy advocate of the parliamentary system as we know it in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the addresses delivered by our colleagues at the 47th Interparliamentary Union Conference be placed in the *Record* immediately following my remarks, and remarks of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, on his extremely good speech on the work of the Interparliamentary Union at our recent conference in Rio de Janeiro.

Congressman FEIGHAN's work at the conference was outstanding. His resolution to incorporate the non-self-governing nations with the non-self-governing territories was well thought out and something that may well be brought out successfully at the next conference. Our colleague certainly gave the Russians and their satellites food for thought, and many of our friends were delighted at the stand he took and the leadership he gave them in trying to fight for the liberty and dignity of the captive nations that have lost all their rights under the heavy paw of the Russian bear.

It is well for this Congress to realize the importance of these conferences, and it is encouraging that one of our Members has taken the time and the trouble to bring the deliberations of the 1958 Conference to our attention.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM OHIO, DELIVERED BEFORE THE 47TH CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION AT RIO DE JANEIRO, SPEAKING ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLIES IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

The quest for peace engages the attention and efforts of men of good will in all parts of the world. All humanity is today beset by strife and tensions which, if allowed to persist, will plunge the world into the disaster of another war. This is the overriding challenge of our times. The question before all of us is: How can we remove the strife and tensions which give rise to war?

One of the outstanding causes of strife and tension is injustice. That is, injustice against people and nations.

In our times it is injustices against entire nations which cause unrest on a scale unparalleled in the history of mankind and thereby retard the winning of a lasting peace. The demand for genuine, representative self-government is heard from the people of all nations who are today the victims of colonialism or imperialism in any form.

The old colonialism is giving way to the rising tide of nationalism as the empires of the past are becoming reconciled to the need for a new world order in which all nations shall govern their own affairs and live at peace with their neighbors. This reconciliation carries with it the high responsibility for assisting the people of the old colonial territories in the task of building free political institutions which will assure representative parliamentary bodies. Only through the exercise of a universal vote, free and secret ballots, the right of multiple political parties which take their case to the electorate at fixed intervals, and parliamentary bodies which adhere to the right of the opposition to dissent, can such free political institutions be built and preserved. In turn this requires responsible local leadership which is responsive to the will of the electorate.

This, then, is the challenge which confronts both the statesmen of the administering power of the non-self-governing territories and the people of such territories. It is a common task in which both interests must assume equal responsibility. There is sufficient good will on all sides to assure success once the objectives are clearly defined and a time set for the accomplishment of the task.

Significant and praiseworthy steps have already been taken by the administering powers in many of the non-self-governing territories. In some, democratic and representative parliamentary bodies are in the process of forming, others are undergoing adjustments to make direct representation of the people a reality. In some the tempo of constructive change is not keeping pace with the popular demands of the politically awakened people. But in practically all these territories the need for a change is recognized and the reconciliation which accompanies it provides the necessary basis for a bright and orderly future.

Turning to the new colonialism, one immediately sees under the yoke of this new imperialism a long array of politically mature and well-established nations which today are non-self-governing, which have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed. These ancient and proud nations, surely no less than the newly awakened nations of Asia and Africa, are worthy of the considerate and continuing interest of this Conference.

During the past 40 years this new colonialism, this new imperialism, has forcibly incorporated once free, democratic, and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spuriously proclaiming that these nations are independent. However, by its own definition, the new imperialism limits this independence to hollow form while the substance of the state, that is, the very life of the state and its people, is completely controlled by an alien, unwanted and predatory power. Clearly, no nation or territory can be self-governing unless the people therein exercise complete control over the internal affairs of the nation and are undisturbed masters of their destiny. The record of the past 40 years demonstrates that the people of these non-self-governing nations will never be satisfied with national independence which is limited to meaningless forms. So long as they are deprived of the essential substance of national independence, which is the right to govern their own affairs free from alien control or direction, they will continue to exercise the only opportunities open to them

to dissent, that is, by internal revolts and freedom revolutions.

Within the past 5 years we have witnessed three outstanding expressions of violent dissent by the people within the orbit of Russian influence. In 1953 there was the mass uprising in East Germany in which the workers and peasants sought to throw off alien rule. This was followed in 1956 by the popular revolts in Poland in which all the people of Poland were in sympathy. Then, in October of 1956, the entire Hungarian nation—workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals, and even some of the new ruling class—rose up in a bloody revolution which resulted in the restoration for 5 historic days of national independence in substance as well as in form. All the people of the world know that it took a major military campaign by the Red army to return Hungary to the status of a non-self-governing nation. Time does not permit a full recount of the many popular uprisings which have taken place over a period of many years in Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, the Baltic States, and in other non-Russian nations. However, the implicit warning carried by these events urges us to find an honorable remedy to end the human strife and dangerous international tensions which they create.

To that end I propose that the draft resolution now before this Conference be amended to reflect the urgent need for developing procedures whereby the people of once free and independent nations which have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing territories shall be accorded the opportunity, under the United Nations supervision, to freely determine substance as well as the form of their government. Such steps would be in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

Allow me to make one point clear, beyond any doubt. I do not include in my proposal the Russian nation itself which, as is well known, is only one of many nations which make up the Soviet Union and its population constitutes a minority. It is strictly an internal matter for the Russian people to determine whether their nation is self-governing. This is not a concern of this Conference nor should it be a concern of the United Nations.

It has always appeared to me to be grossly unjust that in any consideration of the colonial or dependent territory problem that the burden is placed only upon the old colonialism, which as I have said has largely reconciled itself to the inevitable changes taking place in the world. The new colonialism, the new imperialism carries with it a far greater threat to the winning of the peace. Surely the non-Communist world in and of itself cannot expect to eliminate the dangerous international tensions which give rise to war. These tensions can be eliminated only by an equal amount of good will and desire for changes on the part of the ruling class of the new colonialism. That is, changes which accord with the freely expressed will of the people. The cause of peace and amity among nations requires that this burden be borne by all forms of colonialism and imperialism.

To that end I urge this Conference now and in the future to give equal consideration and attention to the problems of non-self-governing nations as that given to non-self-governing territories.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLIES IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

(Address by the Honorable ANTONI N. SADLAK, delegate from the Congress of the United States to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 30, 1958)

Mr. President, in behalf of the delegation from the United States of North America

I wish to emphasize some actual results, some recent accomplishments from our encouragement in the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. My remarks will, I hope, confirm that we mean whatever we say when the United States participates in the attainment of this worthy goal by a territory. Our deeds, I feel, will speak better than volumes of words on this process of self-government to the territories.

Before I make specific mention of the examples, may I stress an obvious truth concerning all territories; namely, that the people of the territories demand freedom because they are not now free and because the governing powers have made them aware of the Western traditions of freedom, of democracy, and of the wealth that has come from industrial civilization.

Often, however, the people of the self-governing areas do not realize that democracy developed slowly in the West over several centuries as the people gradually won greater freedom for themselves and learned how to use it responsibly so that the freedom of their neighbors was not threatened. Today the non-self-governing areas cannot be told to wait 300 years for freedom to come to them. Many demand it now. Others will soon add their voices to the call for liberty. But we know, too, that democracy will probably not work unless the people can receive some training in the democratic process before they become completely self-governing. Thus, democracy today faces a difficult and deeply trying period and, I trust, we parliamentarians have a like and equal and similar understanding of the definition and meaning of the word "democracy."

After all, the representative assembly is one of the most important devices available in trying to solve this seemingly impossible problem of how to create as it were, "instant democracy." The representative assembly provides an opportunity to give the people of the territory experience in the elective process, in enacting laws and administering the nation without giving them full responsibility and power all at once. As it becomes apparent that each new grant of power is used responsibly, the governing nation should increase the powers of the representative assembly and thus gradually bring the territory to self-determination by peaceful means.

May I here insert my complete, unqualified endorsement of the proposed amendment of my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN of the United States, who cites his concern and vigorously protests the deprivation of once free, independent nations which successfully attained complete freedom, and have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing nations by a new colonialism or imperialism.

Now for my examples—the Philippine Islands became independent in 1946 by the mutual consent of the Filipinos and the Americans after a lengthy process in which more and more power was gradually extended to a representative Filipino assembly. Today the Philippines are a Republic with a working democracy, and have an outstanding delegation here in Rio. They also maintain a close and friendly relationship with the United States. On the other hand Puerto Rico rejected independence from the United States and chose to become a commonwealth in 1952. Puerto Rico has the same autonomy in local affairs as one of the United States and its citizens are also United States citizens, but it neither contributes much to the Treasury of the United States nor has voting representation in our Congress. The Puerto Ricans are free to change their status and apply either for full statehood in the United States, or to become completely independent. Finally, I would point out that Alaska has just been made our 49th State

and the people of Hawaii are also seeking statehood rather than independence. I cite these examples, my fellow delegates, to demonstrate that the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories does not necessarily lead to the independence of the territory or become a device for the expression of hatred toward the governing power if a territory does choose independence. Much depends on the character of the past relationship between the territory and the governing power and the compatibility of their interests.

The United States is even beginning the processes of self-government on the 2,000 scattered islands of Micronesia in the South Pacific, which we hold under a U. N. trusteeship agreement. Thus far we have given the islanders a sense of unity that they have never experienced previously. The natives of the more than 1,000 Marshall Islands govern themselves under American guidance by a system of elected officials and a two-house congress, with the upper chamber consisting of hereditary nobles. A constitution is now being drafted for the Ponape district of the Caroline Islands and these same things are taking place for the first time elsewhere in Micronesia which has known only rule by foreign powers for hundreds of years. The goal of the United States is an independent Micronesian federation. I might add that the United States has even permitted the natives of Okinawa and the Bonin Islands to assume a significant degree of local self-government even though these are strategic trusts which we hold under the Japanese Peace Treaty and which will one day be returned to Japan.

In conclusion, I would like to stress once again what the United States feels to be one of the central truths of our time. The peoples of the non-self-governing territories are demanding self-determination in ever-increasing numbers today and if they are to develop as democracies rather than as totalitarian governments, the Western nations must speed up the process of laying the basis for democracy including the development of responsible representative assemblies. Encouragement from the Interparliamentary Union could play a significant part in increasing the number of such assemblies. I hope this will be one result of our meeting here this year.

And, Mr. President, permit me to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the courtesies, for the warmth, and genuine reception by our Brazilian hosts. For me and mine I say—Muito obrigado, caros vizinhos (Thank you very much, dear neighbors).

ADDRESS OF HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE IN BRAZIL, JULY 1958

Mr. President and fellow delegates, those of us who come from the Western Hemisphere are especially proud and happy to be here at the first conference ever to be held in one of our great sister Republics of South America. The friendship and hospitality of the Government and people of Brazil will long be remembered by all members of this Interparliamentary Union, but especially by those members who belong to other American Republics.

Again this year we come to the Conference fortified by the report of our distinguished Secretary General. I have now attended three of these conferences, and I am more amazed today than ever at this report and all that it covers. Almost every detail of the history and the politics of the nations who are members of this Conference is covered. It is true that world history is moving with great rapidity today and that some extremely significant events have happened since the report was written. At the very

opening of the report the Secretary General writes:

"Considering the world situation from the point of view of relations between the great powers an impression of stability is gained, albeit of a superficial nature only. No sign can be seen of any sustained rapprochement, but neither has any direct initiative been taken affecting a status quo which, for the time being, the parties concerned seem to have tacitly accepted."

This situation has changed for the worse and it is devoutly to be hoped that out of the deliberations of this Conference we can achieve a "modus vivendi" that will gradually bring the nations of the world to a true belief that peace cannot be achieved without understanding and tolerance. All nations yearn for peace and it is for us who are members of this Conference to strive mightily for this end.

The report deals at some length with the problems of atomic tests. Here misunderstandings still prevail and are perhaps those most conducive to disaster. In this field real discipline and self control must be created. It is impossible to expect one side to abandon tests until positively assured that the other side will do likewise. This is a poor time and place to indulge in demagoguery, and it was disappointing yesterday to hear accusations that the United States and Great Britain were threatening to use atomic bombs. We know of no such threat, but we do know that the present head of the Soviet Union said: "We will bury you," to an interviewer from the West. This may have been meant as a joke, but some of us may not find it very funny.

The situation in the Middle East is threatening, but American and British troops are in Lebanon and Jordan only because they were called upon by those two small and free nations for the protection which had been promised them in case of need. We are taking nothing from Lebanon or Jordan. We will not murder people to whom safe conducts have been given. We will help them to maintain their freedom, at their request, because we gave them a solemn promise to that effect and we will keep that pledge. As to oil interests, it is almost silly to mention them. The United States and South America have enough petroleum products to supply the Free World for years, if not centuries, to come.

The fact that so many nations today are mere satellites is disheartening in the extreme. The report quotes Mr. Spaak in reference to NATO in the following words:

"The day when there were no longer any discussions between them would be the day when, having accepted one government as leader, the other governments would be no more than mere satellites—and the alliance would have no further reason for existing."

Again we are confronted by the fact that words do not mean the same thing to all people. Even such words as peace and freedom are not the same in all languages.

Our Secretary General is impartial in his thinking and his writing. This, of course, brings us sometimes to the philosophy of "a plague on both your houses," which is not what we enjoy hearing, even though it may be good for the soul.

This report is a great document not only today but for the future when many of us, we hope many of a younger generation, will read and study it with interest and profit as a true and impartial picture of our times. The report also includes the preliminary documents that make up the agenda that we, in this year of grace 1958, considered of the greatest importance.

Since our last conference in London the clouds that menace and surround parliamentary governments all over the world have not lifted. On the contrary, they have become blacker and more dangerous. On that occasion I spoke somewhat pessimistically

about the future of our parliamentary systems. I regret that very little has happened since the London Conference to alter any of these opinions. One thing did happen, however, at our Geneva Conference, which I feel was encouraging, and to which I intend to address myself at this time. On this occasion the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories, presented in the name of the committee a resolution on "The Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories" and this item has been put on the agenda for this Conference. Now, why can we feel that this resolution is an encouraging sign? First, because it shows the world that we believe in representative government as the ultimate toward which all peoples strive. Secondly, because we believe that representative government is capable of growth and improvement. And this is perhaps the most important part of all. Any philosophy, whether of government or of any other science, that becomes static and incapable of change or growth is destined to wither and die.

Finally, I would recommend to you the words of a former President of my country, Herbert Hoover, who said recently in Brussels:

"We must unceasingly strive by all peaceable means to make the world safe for representative government. From representative government alone can come respect for your dignity as men and women, your flowering as individuals, your rights to a rising chance in life, to self-expression, and to security from sodden uniformity."

THE PROBLEMS OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR TESTS

(Address by Hon. W. R. POAGE, 47th Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 28, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, everyone seems to agree that it would be highly desirable for all nations to suspend further atomic tests, and indeed to agree to forego the use of nuclear weapons. I think we can also agree on the desirability of greatly reducing and eventually eliminating all of the military establishments of all types and character throughout the world. In fact, my own country, the United States of America, at the close of World War II, demobilized more than 10 million men. No nation has ever carried out such an extensive demobilization, nor has the Soviet Union, the only other great power with such a large establishment, demobilized to a comparable extent, even though more than a dozen years have now elapsed. We do not know the exact size of the Russian military establishment today, but it is undoubtedly comparable, or even larger than the establishment of all the balance of the world combined. Possibly this tremendous manpower is locked up in unproductive work, because the communistic rulers feel that they do not need to devote the skills and labor of this great force for the improvement of the standard of living of their people. In my country we feel that we need to devote the labor and the skill of our young men to constructive undertakings—to the further improvement of the standard of living of our people and of all the people of the world.

Indeed, it seems to us that, desirable as it may be to limit the testing and the use of atomic weapons, it is even more desirable to reduce the wasteful use of manpower through the maintenance of conventional weapons.

The United States of America has repeatedly expressed its willingness and desire to restrict all types of armaments—both atomic and conventional—but no intelligent person could expect or want us to abandon any weapons without some dependable assurance that the U. S. S. R. will do likewise, and will do it at the same time. Nor do we ask of the

Soviet anything which we are unwilling to extend to them. We would no more think of asking the U. S. S. R. to accept our unsupported promises to abandon weapons than we would accept their unsupported promises.

We recognize that the whole buildup of men and weapons throughout the world is the result of lack of confidence in the sincerity and good will of our neighbors. We hope that the time may soon come when all people will feel as secure against their neighbors as I believe the United States and the people of Canada feel, each as regards the other, but until that ideal situation arrives, there can be no substitute for full and unlimited inspection, to assure the compliance of mutual promises. Such acceptance of mutual inspection is an absolute prerequisite to any effective disarmament, or any control of either use or testing of atomic or nuclear weapons.

Nor is it any answer to say that one of the great powers says that it will forego the use of testing of any type of weapons but demands that its possible victims should accept its unsupported promise. This is particularly true in the face of a long record of the use of force wherever and whenever it seemed expedient. And the very refusal to accept the principle of unrestricted inspection can do nothing but strengthen those doubts.

Let me repeat: the United States of America welcomes any practicable program of mutual control of our reduction in all kinds of armaments, but the control must be mutual. We invite complete inspection of our own arms, even of our atomic development, but that inspection must be mutual. Nor does the United States of America wait until it has just completed its annual series of atomic tests and then suggest a period of suspension of such tests. Such obvious insincerity can do nothing but increase the determination of all other countries to see for themselves that all promises are being fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to emphasize or widen this mistrust, but I feel that the people of the world should clearly understand that mere words will never take the place of deeds. There have been charges of aggression hurled at my country and at Great Britain at this very Conference. These charges stem from the fact that the two great powers have carried out their commitments to protect two small nations from destruction. Of course, we recognize that it would have been far more desirable had the United Nations gone to the protection of these small countries, but the very people who condemn us have stood in the way and refused to allow action by the United Nations. The United States and Great Britain stand ready, as we have always stood, to move out of Lebanon and out of Jordan any day the Soviet is willing to let the United Nations protect these lands. Did Russia make any such offer when she moved troops into Hungary? Let the small nations of the world judge the large powers by their actions, not their words, and let the small nations recognize that it is the military power, and especially the atomic power, of the United States of America, which stands between them and the type of aggression we have witnessed in Korea and Vietnam. We of the United States will not impose our rule on anyone. Ask our neighbors. Ask Canada. Ask Cuba. We want to hold no people under our control. Ask the Philippines. We want to engage in no armament or atomic race. We want to beat our swords into plowshares but we can only do so when we know that others are doing likewise.

We challenge the sincere cooperation of the U. S. S. R. to join in a real, completely inspected program of disarmament. We will meet you halfway, but we have no intention of disarming ourselves without absolute assurance that others are doing likewise.

THE PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE INVESTMENT OF FOREIGN PRIVATE OR GOVERNMENTAL CAPITAL IN COUNTRIES IN PROCESS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Speech delivered by Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa, before Interparliamentary Union Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 26, 1958)

We are gathered today to consider basic issues relating to the role of foreign investment in economic development. I submit that the most direct and significant point of reference for the formulation of a set of principles of foreign investment is to be found in the last four words of the topic of this session. The principles we arrive at will depend in large measure upon our understanding and interpretation of the phrase "process of economic development."

There is the totalitarian road to development. Countries that follow this path seek to advance industrially at the expense of the freedom and liberties of their peoples. Through propaganda, subversion, and more recently, through ostensibly favorable credit terms, they pursue international policies designed to weaken and undermine the independent sovereignty of other nations.

Very different is the democratic process of development based on individual freedom to work, to spend, to save, and to invest. With the demands of modern life and unsettled world conditions, the governments of democratic countries have come to play a much larger role than in earlier periods in promoting economic progress. But this role continues to be nourished in the traditions of free institutions.

All countries, from the most industrially advanced to the relatively backward, are confronted with the problem of obtaining an adequate supply of savings for capital expansion, without which economic progress is not possible. It is to the interest of all the nations of the Free World, since they are economically interdependent, that favorable conditions are created for tapping the sources of savings at home and abroad with which to assure economic growth. These conditions must meet the varying needs of countries in different stages of development.

The foreign economic policies and programs of the United States recognize the importance both of the principle of interdependence and the principle of diversity of countries in various stages of economic development.

In the interests of our own economy and those of the rest of the Free World, we have endeavored to stimulate foreign investment through such a governmentally owned corporation as the Export-Import Bank. Our oldest public institution in this field, it has loaned over \$9 billion for development purposes in more than 50 countries. These loans, both to private borrowers and governments, have helped finance on a sound business basis, mutually beneficial to borrower and lender, power-generating installations, transportation facilities, manufacturing plants, and the extraction industries. Only recently, the lending authorization of the Export-Import Bank was increased by \$2 billion.

The United States is proud of the role it has played in promoting the flow of foreign investment through its participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and in strengthening the international currency system through its membership in the International Monetary Fund. The World Bank has successfully promoted the international flow of capital for productive projects either by lending funds directly, guaranteeing loans made by others, or by participating in such loans. The gross total of loans that the bank has made to 46 countries amounts to \$3.5 billion.

Closely affiliated with the World Bank is the International Finance Corporation. It

was established in 1956 to overcome two limitations on the bank's ability to finance a greater number of private development projects: The lack of equity investment in projects, and the requirement that loans made to a private firm be guaranteed by the government of its country. With the removal of these obstacles, the International Finance Corporation aims to demonstrate that soundly conceived private investment projects in less developed areas can be sufficiently attractive to stimulate a much larger flow of private capital into these areas.

About a year ago, the United States set up the Development Loan Fund to extend long-range financing to underdeveloped countries. The Fund is not in competition with private investment, nor is it competing with the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank. It aims to facilitate the financing of meritorious developmental projects that have difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds. Many of the less developed countries have a limited capacity to service dollar loans on the terms required by the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Under the more flexible terms of the Loan Fund, repayments can be made in local currencies as well as dollars. It can operate with greater flexibility not only because it recognizes the necessity of repayments in terms of local currencies, but because it can also finance either private or governmental projects on an adjustable basis for as long as 40 years.

This brief review of the major governmental programs to stimulate the flow of investment into developmental projects serves to remind us that a variety of financial tools, public and private, has been proved necessary to meet diverse capital needs. But experience has also shown that in the interests of all of the countries of the Free World it is imperative that the economic growth of the underdeveloped areas be accelerated. Such advance depends not only on the readiness of the more industrialized nations to expand the flow of capital to these areas, but also on what the peoples of these countries do for themselves. Their progress depends on the adoption of measures which would encourage investment from inside as well as from outside the country.

I have in mind control of inflation, planning for balanced economic growth and administrative and legislative actions that permit the inflow of capital equipment and services—and the outflow of reasonable earnings.

The technically less advanced countries appreciate more than ever before the importance of capital investment in promotion of economic progress. They frequently place their main hope for such progress on the obtaining of capital from abroad. But the flow of capital depends on the existence of certain basic political and social conditions without which private investment cannot operate. In addition, capital requires technical and managerial skills for effective utilization, a working force that is adaptable to changes in technology, and the development of adequate marketing and credit institutions.

The more advanced industrial nations must also provide more favorable conditions for expanding the role of private domestic investment in underdeveloped areas. The United States has taken a number of steps in this direction. These include the maintenance of information and counseling services for potential investors, as well as strengthened Government staffs overseas equipped to understand the importance of foreign investment. The International Cooperation Administration which provides insurance against loss arising from inconvertibility of local currency earnings, expropriation, and war risks, has been steadily expanding its guaranty program. The Government

has also negotiated an increasing number of bilateral treaties designed to protect more adequately the interests of private investors. It has also provided tax incentives for overseas investment, although more can be done in this field.

In closing, I should like to refer briefly to the draft resolution relating to the agenda for this session. The recent events in the Middle East point up all the more the need for strengthening the economies of underdeveloped areas, especially those which have recently achieved their independence. The draft resolution calls upon the parliaments to adopt the principle of multilateral financing of long-term development projects of underdeveloped nations as against such financing on a bilateral basis. The implications of Resolution No. 3 are far reaching. The proposal involves the establishment of another international organization with subscription of a substantial amount of funds by many different countries. There are many practical difficulties in the creation of additional institutions for multilateral financing, which require further study if we are to build solidly. Also, may I remind you that there are many experts in the field of foreign investment, including many in the countries receiving investments, who are equally convinced that in the present stage of assistance to underdeveloped areas the bilateral approach has so much merit that it should not deliberately be consigned to a place of secondary importance, as is implied in the draft resolution before us. I, therefore, suggest for your consideration that this resolution be modified to provide for further study of the subject.

TRANSLATION OF THE SPEECH DELIVERED BY MADAME NGO DINH-NHU, VIETNAM, GENERAL DEBATE JULY 24, 1958

Mr. President, ladies, gentlemen, it is a particularly pleasant duty for me to bring to this platform, in the name of the Vietnamese delegation, the expression of our gratitude to the Brazilian group for the warm and cordial welcome they have extended to us. Our gratitude is the more profound because we accept that welcome not simply as a gesture of courtesy, but as a new expression of generous and active friendship which the Brazilian people continue to show for faraway Free Vietnam, for her efforts and for her courage.

Certainly we Vietnamese who wish to live in freedom, independence, and peace need a great deal of courage, effort, and sacrifice. In a world such as that just so well described by the Secretary-General in his report, where man finds his share of hope constantly menaced by anguish and terror; in an Asia of which we Vietnamese well understand that we are an integral part and in which geography has placed us at one of the most sensitive points each one of us must know how to face up to destiny.

I have just said that it is Asia which I know best, by our Asian community of experience, of ideals, and of destiny. Speaking of Asia through what I know of Vietnam is not, I believe, greatly limiting to that subject. For, the resurgence of the masses of Asian peoples now coming to play an active role in the course of human events—is this not one of the most salient facts of the twentieth century? The peace and prosperity of the world, the special concern of this conference—do they not depend in large part upon the solutions to the problems of these masses?

And these masses, once political independence has been gained or regained, are extremely impatient to make up for their technical, and consequently economic and social, lag.

What an impassioned undertaking and how immense it is, when we remember that most of our countries are not only one, but two, technical and industrial revolutions behind time—that of the nineteenth century

as well as that which is now being realized in the atomic domain. The internal awakening of these masses does not manifest itself without profoundly influencing the political regimes of the Asian peoples. Some, as Tacit would say, rush headlong into slavery, believing they will find greatness in servitude. Together with most of the others, Vietnam is striving to open for herself a narrow path between an anarchic liberalism and the totalitarian menace—a menace which is very real because, from international peaceful coexistence, totalitarianism during this past year has, by infiltration through the many fissures in the democratic regimes, expanded to an internal coexistence.

This has not come about without provoking varied and sometimes violent reactions in the countries victim to this massive political penetration. Admittedly different in their expressions, these reactions often revolve about a same theme: How to achieve a democracy which is capable of constructing our economies while at the same time defending itself against totalitarian temptations.

In practice this leads us immediately to another subject of great concern—extremely important in the measure that it is involved in the effort for solution to the previously mentioned problem of maintaining a viable democracy in the areas subject to great internal and external pressures: This is the subject of the aid of economically more favored countries to economically underdeveloped countries. In consideration of this, I believe we must not confuse the two kinds of underdeveloped countries. There are, indeed, countries in which development has simply been thwarted for a time, as, for example, by war. This is the case of certain Western countries. But there are also countries, such as most of those in Asia, which are basically underdeveloped, totally devoid of any economic and industrial substructure. To liken the latter to the former and to apply to them the same methods is to risk rendering the generous aid of our friends less effective.

Vietnam, following the examples of her elders in Asian democracy and with the help of her friends, is putting her best efforts into the struggle on all fronts to defend the principle of democracy founded on the concept that each man has a soul, that is to say a goal to attain and an equal right to pursue it in freedom. In practice, particularly in the existing social context of Asia, there exists, however, a certain gap between the economic and social reality, which tends toward planning and collective organization, and its political and judicial expression which has remained individualistic along the liberal lines of the 19th century. It is perhaps this which explains the present paralysis of the free countries in the face of totalitarian infiltration.

To bridge in a certain measure this gap, and with the goal of reinvesting the democratic movement with an indispensable dynamism, the Interparliamentary Union will perhaps best serve peace and democracy if, true to its origins, it leaves the role of political compromise and bargaining to the United Nations, in order itself to be essentially the high moral authority, integral depository for the ideal of human liberty, and promoter of new democratic formulas adapted to the new world.

These are the thoughts, perhaps bold, which are inspired to me by the current events of the world. In submitting them to your sympathetic consideration, I invoke the sign under which I came to this platform, that of friendliness and understanding.

TRANSLATION OF THE SPEECH DELIVERED BY
MME. NAZLI TLABAR, TURKEY

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that you would all agree that one

cannot help a feeling of holiday in this beautiful country, where Brazilian hospitality is to blame. But alas as parliamentarians we are not paid by our people to forget, but to remember our troubles and try to do something about them—it can be said: What can be done here by representatives of assemblies who differ so much? But for those who believe that the human spirit has a tendency to freedom and decency, for those who believe that there are powers of ingenuity, faith and endurance that no one can resist, and for those who believe that because of all this peace is bound to come no matter how difficult some may make it, a lot can be done. And because I am one of those who finds strength in believing I will let my thoughts freely flow on the subjects that have been discussed here today. Who knows they may seed and bear fruit? Isn't that what we are all here for.

The delegate of our host country opened the debate yesterday with an eloquent speech, specially stressing that his country believes in peaceful coexistence among all peoples on the principle of self determination. I couldn't agree more, we are all for the principle of self determination, as long as this determination is free from all outside pressure and as long as it is applied to minorities as well as majorities—I have always envisaged coexistence in Europe between a federated Europe and a liberated Russia. Why should that not be possible some day?

All of us here seem to wish that problems should be solved by peaceful means, but how sad it is that some find it more convenient to eliminate in a horrible manner those that are in their way. Yet some day, these same men will be sitting among us discussing with us, how lasting peace can be preserved. Surely this is not what my colleagues mean, when they speak of the establishment of a rule of law.

A lot has been said on the crisis in the Middle East. My friends have already firmly stressed at the council meeting that Turkey has no intention, by any means to take any action that would aggravate the already grave situation in this area.

We consider nationalism a perfectly healthy and natural movement which we understand and sympathize as long as it is not twisted into wrong channels to suit the imperialist ambitions of others. We believe that nothing can set back true nationalism more than it should be thus perverted.

We believe that the military support given to Lebanon and Jordan was necessary to safeguard peace in the area. We welcome the action. In the light of the brutal overthrowing of the legal government of Iraq, Britain and the United States could have not failed to respond to a plea for assistance from those small countries whose independence was threatened by those whose resources and powers are so much larger. The decision is in accordance with the U. N. Charter, furthermore the United States and Britain should be considered morally bound to take such action, as they were legally invited by legally elected governments.

We would welcome an international police force, of course, but as long as the right of veto is there, how bright are our chances of success?

The question of summit talks continues to create a sort of psychological confusion in the Free World although in reality almost nobody seems to be opposed in principle to summit talks. It would, of course, be utterly naive to believe in the merits of having these talks just for the sake of having them. But after careful preparations of the agenda, if such discussions are to take place, we believe that representatives of all nations concerned, big or small, should be invited to take part. As the peace and wel-

fare of our world does not belong to the strong only, but to all of us. And certainly the easy method of making concessions on the shoulders of smaller nations will no more be accepted or tolerated by them. I will not dwell long on the question of disarmament and the dangers confronting our Free World today, as Turkey's peace-loving and constructive attitude vis-a-vis these questions is well known. We earnestly hope that effective control can be established, so that total disarmament, the hope of millions and millions can at last come true.

Before I end my too-short speech I would like to congratulate the eloquent and charming delegate from Vietnam on her realistic speech. I totally agree with her, that this body should stick to its principles and leave all compromises to the U. N. In this nuclear age, I still believe that there is a tremendous power in ideals, more power than in the poor words with which we seek to imprison them. * * * If this body arms itself with such potential power and firmly fights every falsification of it, then it will be rendering the best and even most practical service to the peoples of the world.

I believe that this is a decisive period in our evolution when the whole future may hang in the balance, when even small happenings now, may tip the scale one way or the other. History is calling on us and the forces of freedom cannot refuse to heed its appeal.

May our joint efforts and deliberations at this conference guide us to the right solutions in the best interests of mankind.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HAL HOLMES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that in the closing days of the 85th Congress that there be spread on the RECORD something of the feeling of regret that is shared by Members of both sides of the aisle that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] has declared his intention to retire from Congress; and in this connection I would like to say two things: first, that it is with a personal sense of loss that Members like myself who hope to return in the future view the gentleman's retirement, and secondly, it is very definitely a loss to the Congress and to the Nation and the people of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington that the gentleman is not returning.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to measure success by something concrete. We find it easier to point to definite achievements that can be felt and seen. As a yardstick in the Congressional District of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] as maybe in no other Congressman's district, the evidence as to the effort and service of Congressional work is evident. Few Members of Congress realize this fact and certainly because of the inordinate modesty of the gentleman, few of his constituents have realized that the Yakima project which includes the irrigation and river development programs in the gentleman's district is the most extensive and successful development of its size in America. The wealth that comes out of the soil in the way of products as I understand, since this development started exceeds

\$1 billion and some of the projects have already paid off and others are in the process of returning to the Federal Government the investment that was made in them. Much of this, along with much of the Columbia River Basin's multipurpose development projects are due to his persistent, although inconspicuous, efforts.

As those of us who have worked with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] know only too well, he has quietly, and as I have already said, all too modestly met the responsibilities of his office and as a result he has been a great asset to his District in a very concrete and tangible way. But, Mr. Speaker, the intangible public service of our friend and colleague as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and in his general service to the Nation as a Member of the House, in value is beyond calculation. The conscientious efforts that he has put into legislation for the general good both in committee and in the House is something that will never be adequately recognized and only those who have worked with him day in and day out will fully appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of high principle, intellectual ability and conscientiousness, our friend and colleague has gained a position of respect enjoyed by few Members during his long service.

Personally, if I am fortunate and return next year, I shall miss his presence in this Chamber, but in any event I shall carry with me real gratitude for the help given me by him when I first came to Congress and for his cooperation which I have always had since that time. As I say, I shall always be personally indebted to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] for his help and likewise for his friendship. Certainly we of the Washington State delegation have enjoyed the association with him, and likewise let me say that my wife and I are going to miss his charming wife, Margaret, who is, of course, beloved and warmly regarded along with her husband by so many other Members and their wives.

In the future I shall have one advantage over many of my colleagues, in that my home will be close to Ellensburg where the Holmes family lives. As such, I anticipate many opportunities to visit and to continue the association of six memorable years in Congress. Meanwhile, however, I join with others in saying "well done" to a person of great ability and character, a person whose friendship means a great deal. I join, Mr. Speaker, in wishing our colleague well and in all too inadequate words add my tribute to his splendid service to the people of his district and of our Nation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues will not seek reelection this fall. Amongst them is our good friend, HAL HOLMES, who is completing his 16th year as a Member of this House. He has served his State and Nation with distinction in this body, and all of us who have served with him will be sorry to see him leave. We shall miss his good judgment, counsel, and advice. We shall also miss his friendliness and willingness to be helpful.

Few, if any, have excelled him in his devotion to the duties of his office. His

attendance record at his committee meetings and at the sessions of the House is almost a perfect one. He has been a most conscientious Member of this body and has worked hard at his assignments. No problem or task was too difficult for him to undertake.

The problems of the people of his district were, of course, given his special attention. No Representative served his people more effectively than did HAL HOLMES. One has only to visit his District to see the results of his contributions to the welfare of his area.

Leaving with HAL will be his lovely and devoted wife, Margaret. Much of the credit for our colleague's distinguished record must be attributed to her. She has been a true helpmate. These are two wonderful people and I want to wish them continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It was with great regret that I learned several months ago that our colleague, HAL HOLMES, was not going to stand for reelection.

In the 16 years HAL HOLMES has been in Congress he and his good wife, Margaret, have become institutions in all Congressional circles. They have won niches of affection in our heart and the admiration of our minds.

To his colleagues of Washington State HAL HOLMES always has been a source of sound advice.

I can recall no Congressman in my time who has accomplished so much for our State and the Pacific Northwest, its development and prosperity and therefore the happiness and well-being of its people. Many of the power dam facilities and the defense installations of eastern Washington were "his babies." He sponsored and he fought them through committees and Congress until these became realities.

HAL HOLMES is a most modest man, a quality unusual in politicians. He never sings his own praises or tells of his accomplishments. His friends know these were many and important.

HAL HOLMES has been diligent and faithful. He has one of the best attendance records in the Congress. His mind is filled with a fund of information on many legislative subjects acquired by long study and a retentive memory. He expresses himself colorfully, clearly, and effectively. It is a joy to listen to him expound on national issues and problems. He has made his information available readily and willingly to all of us, and for this I know others are most grateful. HAL HOLMES has been one of our soundest and most reliable advisers.

I wish HAL were not retiring from Congress, but he is. I want him and his wife, Margaret, to know that all our best wishes go with them and will follow them, as will our hopes for their health and happiness.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to HAL HOLMES. We came to Congress at the same time 16 years ago. It has been a real pleasure to serve with HAL. His understanding of the varied legislation that has passed through this

Chamber during that time has been tremendous and his council has been sought and appreciated by all of us.

HAL was devoted to his job—both as a high ranking member of the great Committee on Ways and Means and to the multiple measures that affected his district, his State, the Nation and the world. His record of attendance was one of the very best.

I, too, want to pay my respect to his lovely wife, Margaret, who has gathered to her heart so many friends here in Washington and who has been such a great asset to HAL in all his activities. May God bless them and be with them always.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is going to miss the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] when he does not return next year. His service began with the 78th Congress, the same time that I came here, and a warm friendship between us started immediately. His quiet manner, his gentle kindness, and his high sense of humor won him many friends who all regret his decision not to seek reelection. In addition to his other traits he has a keen and analytical mind which brought much wisdom to the discussions of the great Committee on Ways and Means on which he served.

Mrs. Auchincloss and I wish him and his delightful wife, Margaret, all of the best in the days to come, and we hope they will return to Washington once in a while to nourish a friendship that means much to us.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the great Members of this legislative membership, the Honorable HAL HOLMES, of Washington.

HAL is a great American—a gentleman and a scholar in every respect. I am proud to say that he and his gracious wife are close friends of the McGregors, and I sincerely wish them every happiness in their retirement.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for these fine words.

During my 16 years as a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of Washington I have known many friends. It is these friends and the many people I have known and personally worked with throughout my service in the Congress that I will miss. This body is a body of great men, dedicated men who work hard for their respective districts and their country. It has been a privilege to serve with you.

I can only say, thank you, and I wish you all good luck and extend my best wishes to you all.

HON. DAVID WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure that the Honorable David Williams, a judge who lives in Concord, in my District, was elected unanimously at the Disabled American Veterans convention to be their commander for the next year. He will bring a great fund of information

and a tremendous amount of zeal to furthering the cause of the disabled veterans. He has dedicated his life to helping the veterans, disabled and otherwise, for many years. He is a very fine soldier and veteran and a constituent of whom I and hundreds of others are very proud. I shall talk more of him tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I hope so much that the avalanche of bills that have passed and, that with so many billions being given to almost every group in the country a little bill of mine, H. R. 8424, to give a little group at the Capitol the benefit of subscribing to retirement benefits that passed the House unanimously and is now pending in the Senate, will be passed before we adjourn. It would be incredible to me that that bill could be pigeonholed and have to wait for another year. It is a most deserving and righteous bill. It would be punitive not to pass it. I hope Members will ask the other body with me to pass it.

THE CASE FOR AN INTER-AMERICAN BANK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, since the mid-thirties there has been consistent demand for an Inter-American Bank designed to promote trade and improve the prosperity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Unfortunately for those who believe that such a bank would serve a favorable purpose, the United States has consistently refused any financial support for the proposal. Significantly, however, with the current reappraisal of the United States policies toward our neighbor republics in this hemisphere the proposal for an Inter-American Bank has again come forward and it may now receive greater attention than in previous years.

Over the years our Government has argued that there is already sufficient investment capital available, public and private, to insure development in Central and South America at the optimum rate. Since Vice President Nixon's ill-fated trip there has been a growing belief that we have been deficient in meeting special Latin American needs and desires. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, upon his return from Central America, expressed the opinion that our Government must become more positive in extending economic assistance to Latin America. Against this background is the fact that the administration has recently proposed a regional institution for the Middle East. Obviously, now the United States is in an awkward position unless it supports an institution in the Western Hemisphere.

It is not generally known, but there is little trade between the Latin American countries. They do not buy and sell in quantity to each other. It is logical to suppose that the existence of a hemisphere bank would encourage more commerce between the nations of the hemisphere. It could lead to greater trust and confidence in each other and the

United States. Such an institution could help to overcome the feeling among Latin American nations that the United States tries to dominate them, if not for selfish reasons, then at least by the exercise of overcautious paternalism. It could strengthen the feeling of dignity and equality and help to direct nationalism into constructive channels. It should show clearly the good motives of the United States in lending a friendly hand to establish and support an institution which if properly managed can be of real assistance in developing material and human resources in Central and South America. Such a Bank could even be the first step in hastening the processes of economic integration which already is being talked about and which may become of real importance in the future. Presumably, the institution would be more sensitive than present facilities to special needs such as housing, education, and health, which are so necessary for well-balanced development.

A part of the reluctance which has been shown by this country in aiding the creation of a hemisphere bank undoubtedly is due to the fact that already we are a major participant in a number of international banking institutions and the fear that the creation of an institution peculiar for this hemisphere would lead to requests for similar institutions for other specific regions of the world. I submit that we have a particular interest in this hemisphere and its people. They are our closest neighbors and our staunch friends. This hemisphere can be very largely self-sustaining once it is properly developed. The prosperity of the Western Hemisphere means continued prosperity for the United States. We have direct and compelling reasons to stand by and strengthen our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. The establishment of an Inter-American Bank is sufficiently important for the project to stand on its own feet. It is justified in my opinion without regard to our participation in other banks and could not be held to create a precedent for similar participation in other area banks. I consider it a long-overdue step.

SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for his kindly mention of Philadelphia Catholics' early contribution to America along with fellow members of the faith in Baltimore, Boston, New York, and Louisville. With justifiable Yankee pride he speaks of the atmosphere of tolerance Roger Williams set up in his Rhode Island haven. Williams knew bigotry and oppression and it taught him tolerance. In like manner the founder of the Pennsylvania colony had been a religious refugee in Holland. William Penn and his Society of Friends made

Penn's Woods a religious sanctuary for Europeans of all sects who were suffering persecution because of their way of looking up to God.

As a result our State provided refuge for many followers of Peter Memmo and other Germans whose descendants have become known as the Pennsylvania Dutch. A Catholic mission was located at Ivy Mills as early as 1729 and Philadelphians can still worship in Old St. Joseph's at Fourth and Willings Alley, founded by Jesuits in 1733.

As history well records, Catholics have made contributions to all important events including the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the wars in which our Nation has been engaged. Where our national welfare has been at stake they served as Americans, not as Catholics.

There are monuments of Christianity that have been erected by the early pioneers who brought the cross to the new continent. The padres who left their picturesque little missions on our west coast forsook the relative comforts of Spain to blaze a new spiritual trail on the new continent. As our east coast became colonized men brought their religion with them. The colony of Maryland was named for the Mother of Christ. It was a Catholic settlement and it is noteworthy that Lord Baltimore guided through the Assembly of Maryland the famous Act of Toleration of 1649.

To quote the gentleman from Massachusetts about our own Quaker City:

All of us know well that toleration depends on more than legislative acts. It demands charity, love, one toward another. The people of the archdiocese of Philadelphia learned this lesson well. When Bishop Michael Egan laid the first cornerstone in that great city, he was met by sporadic outbursts of bigotry. The Catholic people, under the leadership of such bishops as the strong James Fenwick, the saintly John Newman, and the unruffled Patrick Ryan, provided an antidote. During the plagues of the 18th and 19th centuries and even during the great influenza epidemic of 1918, the priests and sisters cared for the sick indiscriminately. During the Civil War many communities of sisters braved the battlefields to care for the wounded. A monument to their memory stands here in Washington.

In the 20th century it was Denis Cardinal Dougherty who began to strengthen organized charity in the archdiocese. Now the 1,400,000 Catholics of Philadelphia, under the wise and scholarly administration of Archbishop John O'Hara, display an enviable record: 14 general hospitals; 6 sanitariums; 17 asylums for orphans and infants; 14 homes for the aged; and 5 protective institutions; all open to the public. This work is only an example of what the Catholic people throughout the entire country are doing to care for the needs of their fellow men.

A recent publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "The State and Nonpublic Schools," begins with this statement:

"Nonpublic educational institutions are and have always been a significant part of the Nation's total educational resources. These institutions serve millions of American youth and adults each year. They play an enormous role in transmitting our cultural heritage and enriching it. They make contributions at all levels of education and

in all areas. They exert a tremendous influence in fashioning the American way of life."

This paragraph states well the contribution of private schools to the Nation, and it is no secret that many of these schools belong to the Catholic school system. In each of the celebrating archdioceses Catholic education has always been a major concern.

As the eastern seaboard population has swelled, Philadelphia's growth has kept pace and Catholic expansion has been proportionate. This is shown in the establishment of parishes. I name herewith a few of the early churches and then enumerate those either situated in or serving my constituents, giving the date of founding:

Early before the Revolutionary War: 1729, Ivy Mills Mission (near Chester); 1733, St. Joseph's; 1763, St. Mary's.

After the Revolutionary War: North of Girard Avenue and east of Broad Street: 1833, St. Michael's (Second Street); 1842, St. Peter's; 1843, St. Stephen's; 1845, St. Joachim's; 1845, St. Ann's; 1849, St. Dominic's; 1850, St. Malachy's; 1865, St. Edward's; 1870, Maternity of Blessed Virgin Mary; 1872, St. Veronica's; 1873, Visitation; 1882, Nativity of Blessed Virgin Mary; 1884, St. Leo's; 1889, Our Lady of Mercy; 1889, St. Bonaventure's; 1890, Presentation of Blessed Virgin Mary; 1892, St. John Cantius; 1899, Ascension; 1911, Mater Dolorosa; 1911, St. Cecelia's; 1914, Our Lady of Pompeii; 1916, St. Henry's; 1917, Our Lady of Consolation; 1919, St. Bartholomew's; 1919, St. Joan of Arc; 1920, St. William's; 1922, St. Hugh's; 1922, St. Katherine of Sienna; 1923, St. Martin's; 1923, St. Ambrose; 1927, St. Matthew's; 1927, St. Bernard's; 1928, St. Timothy's; 1928, Holy Innocents'; 1928, Resurrection; 1950, St. Christopher's; 1954, Our Lady of Ransom; 1955, St. Jerome's; 1958, Our Lady of Calvary.

Freedom of worship is among the most important privileges guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. It was spawned in a period of European history when bigotry and religious persecution prevailed in many European nations. Unwittingly, the bigots of Europe assisted greatly in the colonization of America. At the invitation of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Philadelphia is glad to join Baltimore, Boston, New York, and Louisville in lauding the survival and development of religious tolerance in our Nation.

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENT, 1953-58

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very significant year for American agriculture and I think it most appropriate as this Congress is about to conclude its business that we pause and consider some of the gains achieved for our farmers and ranchers.

We have been blessed throughout most of the Nation this year with favorable growing conditions. Harvests show signs of being the most productive in America's history. We are happy for our farmers that this is true. We should

always be thankful that ours is a Nation of abundance rather than scarcity.

Yes, our agricultural economy has been on the rise. There is no recession in agriculture. It has been one of the bright spots in our economy this year. Prices received by our farmers and ranchers are generally well ahead of last year and farmers' income for the first 6 months of this year showed a remarkable increase over last year.

Too often we let the cries of the critics drown out the gains achieved by this administration. Let us then take a look at some of the agricultural accomplishments chalked up in the past 5½ years:

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS 1953-58

Surplus commodities which cost \$14 billion were moved out of storage and into use in 5 years. Inventory of surpluses has been pared from its peak of \$8,930,000,000 to \$7,160,000,000. Overall production and consumption of most farm products are now more nearly in balance than at any time since the height of the Korean war.

REA has helped 988 rural electric and 596 rural telephone systems since 1953. Electric loans last year reached \$241 million; telephone loans are being made at the level of about \$90 million a year.

Exports grew from \$2.8 billion in 1953 to an alltime high of \$4.7 billion in fiscal 1957 and continued at a high level in 1958 with \$4.1 billion in shipments.

Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 95 percent since 1953.

Repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery saves farmers \$60 million a year.

Farmers in 1954 were benefited by the largest tax reduction in history.

Gross farm income in the first half of 1958 was the highest on record—\$13.8 billion. Realized net income was at an annual rate of \$13.3 billion—22 percent above the first half of 1957.

Per capita farm income rose from \$838 in 1950 to \$967 in 1957, the second highest on record.

Owner equities rose 7 percent during 1957 to a peak of \$168.4 billion. Farm ownership is at a record high, and there is a smaller proportion of tenants than ever before. Farm foreclosures are near an alltime record low.

The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles and other conveniences owned by farm families.

Twenty-seven million acres of farmland were taken out of production by the Soil Bank in 1958 alone. These acres would have otherwise added to our surpluses. In addition, participating farmers—while adding to their income—are making unprecedented strides in the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

In periods of livestock market gluts, 550 million pounds of meat and meat products worth \$225 million were bought for distribution to school lunch and other eligible outlets. Cattle and hog prices were thus bolstered.

Family type farms received loans totaling \$178 million in 1958 as compared to \$130 million in 1953. Farm ownership loans totaled \$50.3 million compared to \$29.7 million in 1953.

Insured loans to farmers have averaged \$315,651,000 a year for the past 5 years.

The volume of housing loans made per month rose from an average of \$1,931,000 prior to March of this year and close to \$8,151,000 during June.

About 60 million people in 80 foreign countries are receiving food and fiber donated by the people of the United States.

Six billion dollars worth of surplus farm products have been shipped under Public Law 480 to meet the needs of foreign countries.

Important new facilities were established to insure future agricultural progress and livestock health. Among these is the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in Long Island Sound where diseases foreign to our country are being studied for control purposes. Native diseases will be studied at the new Ames, Iowa, laboratory.

Mexico was given financial and technical assistance in wiping out an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which, had it spread, would have meant incalculable losses for United States stockmen.

States with modified certified brucellosis-free status increased from 3 in 1954 to 13 in 1958. Activities are being intensified.

A milestone was reached by the Forest Service in 1957 when for the first time one billion trees were planted.

Timber cut in national forests is at the rate of \$115 million per year, the highest on record.

Forest fires in 1957 were reduced to an alltime low.

The importance of water to farm and city people was recognized by this administration. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established and meets regularly to plan for the future.

One hundred and twenty-three local watershed projects in 41 States were receiving assistance as of August 1958.

The internal revenue law was amended to permit farmers and ranchers to deduct from their taxes expenditures made for installing certain soil and water conservation practices.

The rural development program is raising living standards of those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder through the cooperation of the Federal Government and local authorities. Work is progressing in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

The Great Plains conservation program is operating in 288 counties. The long-range purpose is to minimize drought, flood, and wind erosion damage in the Western States once embraced in the "Dust Bowl."

The Special Milk Program was inaugurated in 1954. The program was operated last year in 75,000 schools where nearly 2 billion half pints of milk were distributed.

The School Lunch Program absorbs large quantities of surplus foods. Last year's total purchases were \$475 million. Complete meals in 1958 were increased 900 million over the 1,000 million served in 1951.

The agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs. The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

Soil Conservation Service appropriations increased each year between 1953 and fiscal 1959 as follows: 1953—\$70 million; 1954—\$73 million; 1955—\$81 million; 1956—\$91 million; 1957—\$97 million; 1958—\$121 million; 1959—\$128 million.

The number of Soil Conservation Districts assisted in 1957 totaled 2,768 compared to 2,493 in 1952.

The Agricultural Marketing Service was established in the Department's reorganization of 1953 to give greater emphasis to problems of marketing and the distribution of farm commodities.

The bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established in 1953. The Department works with it in reviewing national agricultural policies and in developing and administering farm programs.

The agricultural attaché system was returned to the Department, helping to strengthen efforts to expand foreign markets.

Operation Outdoors was set up to expand family recreational facilities in the national forests.

Income from dairying was the highest on record last year.

Per capita consumption of such high protein, protective foods as meat, milk, and eggs is substantially above prewar levels.

Emergency livestock feed programs have helped farmers and ranchers stave off disaster from drought, floods, etc. Farmers have received about 145 million hundred-weight of feed with the Government paying \$146 million of the total cost.

Farmers have added about 350 million bushels in new storage capacity while industry has been encouraged to increase its capacity by 600 million bushels in the largest grain storage program in history.

Approximately \$600 million a year had been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953.

The Water Facilities Act was amended to provide for direct and insured loans for certain soil and water conservation activities in all States. Prior to this amendment, the act had applied to the westernmost States only.

TELEPHONE COMPANY WINDFALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include several letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last spring one of the principal items in the papers was a cut in dairy price supports which was ordered by the administration and later put into effect. Consumers were told by the Secretary of Agriculture that they could expect to benefit in lower retail prices paid for milk, cheese, and butter among other dairy products if only the prices paid to farmers were cut. The United States Department of Agriculture now reports in the August 1958 issue of *The Dairy Situation* that milk and cheese prices are not lower for June of this year than they were a year ago. It proudly points out that butter prices are down but buries in the text of the report that the butter price is down only three-tenths of 1 cent in June of 1958 as compared with June of 1957. The very next sentence, not noted in the bulletin highlights, reports that the price of cheese for June rose one-half cent over a year ago.

So much for that rosy spring promise to consumers which withered and died in the summer sun.

About the time the administration was showing this interest in consumers I learned of hearings of the House Antitrust Subcommittee which indicate that the public has paid \$159 million to the telephone company over and above a 6.5 percent rate of return to owners of the company on public long-distance calls. I believe wholeheartedly that investors deserve a return on their money. I also believe that in utility operations when that guaranteed return exceeds the amount our experts consider reasonable the public deserves a return on its overcharge.

Because of the administration concern for consumers I called these hearings to the attention of the White House. I was referred to the Federal Communications Commission for further information and

after several letters found that the problem is being ignored as it relates to John Q. Public.

The interesting part of this story is the fact disclosed in hearings of the House Antitrust Subcommittee last spring that the expert telephone staff members working for the FCC, who are most familiar with the problem, have long recognized this windfall and on two separate occasions recommended to the commissioners that the public deserved a review of rates. Those recommendations received no more action from the Commission than did my inquiries in behalf of long-distance callers. The very least the public deserves out of this is a 6.5 percent rate of return on the overcharge instead of the cold shoulder it is receiving from the Federal Communications Commission.

In order that the public may know what I have tried to do on this subject, I am submitting for the RECORD, my correspondence file on this matter:

MAY 2, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When Secretary of Agriculture Benson reduced dairy price supports last December, he showed the administration's concern for consumers by noting that consumers should benefit from reduced prices.

Testimony before a House committee revealed Wednesday that the FCC in 1953 granted the Bell Telephone Co. a long-distance rate increase, without public hearing, so that the company's returns have exceeded the 6.5-percent margin considered reasonable for almost 5 years.

Mr. President, telephone subscribers are consumers too. Many in my District place long-distance calls. I respectfully call this to your personal attention because I know you prize consistency.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 16, 1958.

The Honorable LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: The President asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of May 2 concerning the increased interstate long-distance telephone rates filed with the Federal Communications Commission by the Bell System effective as of October 1, 1953, and the level of interstate earnings that has obtained subsequent thereto.

As you know, the Federal Communications Commission, when acting in an adjudicatory capacity is an independent agency. The President can exercise no control whatever over its decisions. When acting in this capacity, the Commission is considered to be an agency responsible to the Congress.

If you desire any information about the 1953 AT&T rate increase, I suggest you write to the FCC.

Sincerely,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
Special Counsel to the President.

MAY 23, 1958.

Mr. JOHN DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOERFER: At the suggestion of Gerald D. Morgan, special counsel to the President, I am writing to you for information concerning the 1953 A. T. & T. rate increase.

According to the hearing before the House Antitrust Subcommittee April 30, the long-distance rate increase was granted without public hearing. Is this true?

It was also reported that the rate of return considered reasonable on the telephone company's investment is 6.5 percent, and that under the 1953 increase the system received a 7.7 percent rate of return on interstate service in 1955; 7.8 percent in 1956; and 7.3 percent in 1957. The amount of profit to the company as a result of this rate increase was reported to be \$159 million in excess of the 6.5 percent return considered reasonable. Are these facts as reported?

The administration has taken an active interest in consumers. When dairy price supports were scheduled for a reduction last December it was reported that the cut should have a beneficial effect upon consumers because prices would be lowered to them on dairy products. As a former resident of Wisconsin, I think you must already know that the price support cut will cost Wisconsin dairy farmers about \$40 million per year.

Now some of these dairy farmers are telephone subscribers who place long distance calls and they deserve consumer protection too. Would you kindly tell me what share of the \$159 million mentioned above was derived from Wisconsin subscribers? Will you also let me know as soon as possible what action the Federal Communications Commission is taking to protect the interests of telephone subscribers from this unnecessary overcharge? I would also be interested in knowing what action the Commission contemplates to get back and return to the telephone ratepayers the amount they have paid in excess of a reasonable rate of return since 1953.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

JULY 8, 1958.

Mr. JOHN DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOERFER: Last May 23 on the suggestion of Gerald D. Morgan, special counsel to the President, I wrote to you for information concerning the 1953 A. T. & T. rate increase on long distance calls. A copy of my letter to you is enclosed.

You called me later and requested additional time to prepare an answer which would give the full views of the Federal Communications Commission on the matter. I agreed.

Since our conversation I know you have been busy with many matters. I also note that the FCC has taken a commendable step in cutting back on private line telephone rates. I wish to congratulate you on this action in the public interest.

As I understand it, public long distance rates discussed in my letter of May 23, 1958 to you are not affected by the FCC report 398 dated June 25, 1958.

I hope your reply to my May 23 letter will be sent soon and that it will have good news for the general public using long distance lines.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

JULY 14, 1958.

Mr. JOHN DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOERFER: This letter will confirm our telephone conversation of this morning in regard to my inquiry to the Federal Communications Commission through you on May 23 and the followup letter I sent on July 8.

Your report today that the FCC now has under adjudication the question of what constitutes a reasonable rate of return on public long distance telephone calls was the first information I have had that this matter

is now being considered by the Commission. I am sorry you did not mention it when you called me in regard to the May 23 letter to request additional time to prepare an answer. However, I am pleased to know that the FCC now has under adjudication the question of how much profit is reasonable on the long distance charges paid by the public.

I appreciate your concern that my letters to the Commission might possibly get some attention in the press because of the current investigation of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. There is nothing secret about my correspondence with the Commission. My only request is that when my correspondence file is made available to anyone it include all the letters in their entirety.

My request to you for information is no more than that. Had I been informed that an adjudication of what constitutes a reasonable rate of return on long distance telephone charges paid by the public was under way it would have been unnecessary for me to inquire about it as I am confident the Commission will issue a report.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1958.

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: Thank you for your kind indulgence in permitting me to delay an answer to your May 23 letter until after oral argument in the present pending telephone private line rate case.

As you indicated there are some matters in your letter which may be deemed inappropriate to discuss.

However, with respect to your inquiry whether a long-distance rate increase was granted in 1953 without a hearing, the answer is "Yes." Both increases and decreases in the past have been granted to common carriers engaged in domestic and foreign wire and radio communication services without a hearing but not, however, until after investigation.

You indicate that the rate increase in 1953 "was reported to be \$159 million in excess of the 6.5 percent return considered reasonable." This report is not accurate. It was estimated that the new rates would produce additional revenues of about \$65 million annually and a calculated rate of return of 6.5 percent, which was regarded to be in the "zone of reasonableness."

A year or more after the new rates were made effective, there was an unanticipated upsurge in the carriers' traffic and as a result instead of the new rates producing a return in the neighborhood of 6.5 percent, as they were originally designed to do, a higher return was actually realized. The \$159 million you referred to represents for the period 1955-57, inclusive, the cumulative difference in revenues actually received and what would have been realized had a 6.5 percent rate of return been maintained. You might also be interested to know that rate reductions prior to the October 1953 increase amounting to over \$250 million on an annual basis and based on 1952 traffic volume were negotiated by this Commission without formal hearing. The cumulative effect of such reductions from the time they were effected until the present time amounts to several billion dollars.

As you know the accounts of the Bell System companies are required to be maintained in accordance with the rules and practices prescribed by the Commission. The departmental and field office staffs of this Commission make appropriate examinations to ascertain that the accounting rules are being complied with. This Commission is continuously engaged also in prescribing and revising depreciation rates and practices ap-

plied by all Bell System telephone companies. The Bell System telephone companies as well as all other communications common carriers subject to our jurisdiction, are required to file monthly and annual reports setting forth comprehensive operating financial and earnings data. In the case of the Bell System telephone companies, this information is supplemented by submission of substantial amounts of additional financial and operating data, including detailed monthly reports. This information is also subjected to continuous review and analysis by the Commission.

You will appreciate that as a result of the above-described continuing regulatory supervision and surveillance, this Commission at all times is in a reasonably well-informed position to evaluate the adequacy of revenues and earnings and the need for either rate increases or rate reductions. Several interstate rate reductions which have been negotiated by the Commission with the Bell System over the years were made possible largely by this method of regulation. This, so far as I am able to ascertain, has been the practice most frequently employed ever since the adoption of the Communications Act of 1934.

It may be of interest to note that long-distance rates are only 10 percent higher today than at the close of World War II as compared with the cost of goods and services which certainly have experienced far greater increases.

Our interstate ratemaking problems differ a good deal from those encountered by State commissions. The developments in the techniques of long lines communications have made possible the economic use of facilities, such as microwave radio and coaxial cable, which can convey hundreds of messages at the same time at very low unit costs. Because of the nature of intrastate traffic, the use of similar facilities is not economically feasible on a State or local basis. Accordingly, this Commission has been able to effectuate rate reductions over the years, whereas all of the State commissions have been faced with inevitable and repeated rate increases. On the other hand, interstate or long lines earnings are much more volatile as compared with intrastate earnings, and hence rates of return for intrastate and interstate services are not comparable.

In any event, since some of these matters are presently under consideration I cannot elaborate upon them with propriety at this time. Thank you for your interest in this matter. If there is any further information you may desire, I will, of course, try to be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman.

AUGUST 4, 1958.

Hon. JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOERFER: On May 23 I wrote you in regard to testimony developed by the House Antitrust Subcommittee over testimony developed by the subcommittee that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. received without public hearing a rate increase which brought returns of \$159 million in excess of a 6.5 percent rate of return considered reasonable by the FCC during the years 1953 to 1957.

In your reply of July 14 you state:

"The \$159 million you referred to represents for the period 1955-57, inclusive, the cumulative difference in revenues actually received and what would have been realized had a 6.5 percent rate of return been maintained."

You then point out that previous rate reductions ordered by the FCC would have amounted to several billion dollars by this time if not put into effect. I commend the commission for carrying out its duty in pre-

vious years and again call your attention to the \$159 million which you call cumulative difference and which I call excess profit. Having done its duty in the past I am sure the Commission will now take some positive action in regard to this \$159 million.

Last May I asked you what action the Commission contemplates to get back and return to public long distance ratepayers the \$159 million cumulative difference they have paid the telephone company in excess of a 6.5 percent rate of return.

You have not answered my inquiry. You replied:

"In any event, since some of these matters are presently under consideration I cannot elaborate upon them with propriety at this time."

I am not asking you to comment upon matters under consideration. I am asking you if, indeed, they are under consideration. My question is this: Is the Federal Communications Commission, as you have implied, now conducting an adjudication of rates charged the public for long distance telephone calls?

Again let me say I have no objection whatsoever to having my correspondence with you made public so long as the entire file is released when it is made public.

I trust it will take no more than a week to reply to this simple inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., August 8, 1958.

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: This is in reply to your letter of August 4, 1958, regarding the rates charged by the Bell System for interstate long-distance telephone calls.

The Commission does not have a formal proceeding in progress at this time with respect to the rates charged by the Bell System companies for the message-toll-telephone segment of their interstate operations. A formal hearing is now in progress with respect to the rates charged by these companies, as well as the Western Union Telegraph Co., for their interstate private-line services. Many ratemaking problems which are involved in the regulation of rates for communications services are under consideration in these proceedings, as indicated in the last paragraph of our letter of July 14, 1958. In addition, the matter of the reasonableness of the earnings of the Bell System companies from their interstate operations is under continuing review and surveillance.

Recently, the Commission carefully reviewed the current status of the Bell System's interstate earnings in the light of the many factors involved, such as the current cost of money, general economic conditions, and the effect of these conditions on the volume of interstate telephone business and the level of interstate earnings. As a result, the Commission concluded that a general investigation of the overall level of interstate rates and earnings is not warranted at this time. We shall, of course, continue our practice of maintaining a continuing surveillance over these matters. May we assure you that the Commission will take prompt and appropriate action by formal proceedings or otherwise, as may be necessary, should the circumstances indicate that such action is required to protect the public interest in just and reasonable telephone rates.

In our letter of July 14 we noted that the rates for interstate long-distance telephone services are only 10 percent higher today than at the close of World War II. During this same period, the rates for intrastate toll and local exchange services have increased approximately 44 percent and the Consumer

Price Index has increased by approximately 59 percent.

We trust that the foregoing will be of assistance to you and will furnish you with the information which you desire. If you wish any further information regarding this matter we will, of course, be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. LEE,
Acting Chairman.

SECRECY MANIA OF AEC

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1958 I personally delivered to two Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Graham and Mr. Floberg, a letter containing 21 questions. Nearly 3 months later, on August 15, 1958, I finally received an answer, an answer which I was told by Commissioner Floberg had been rewritten six times, an answer, Mr. Speaker, which leans heavily on the excuse that no answers can be made because the material is classified.

What about this secrecy mania of the AEC? Is it really necessary for national security? Does it really serve the best interests of the United States?

Based on the findings of my trip to Eniwetok last May I am certain that much of the secrecy is unnecessary and actually harmful both to our position in the eyes of the world and to our efforts to make scientific progress in this vital area.

If I am returned to the House next year I intend to introduce legislation to provide for a Department of Nuclear Energy whose chief would be a member of the President's Cabinet. It is also my hope that Senator ANDERSON, who will then be chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, will be able to arrange for his committee to delve into this matter of secrecy and see if the American people and the world cannot be told more about our policies in attempting to harness this fearful force with such infinite capacity for evil or good.

Under previous consent to extend my remarks I now include my letter of May 26, 1958, to the Atomic Energy Commission with the reply sent to me on August 15, 1958 by the AEC over the signature of Commissioner John F. Floberg, and with comments by me on the reply given.

MAY 26, 1958.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Here are a number of questions which I should like the Commission to answer in an unclassified letter:

Mr. Floberg's letter begins:

On the 26th of May and at your request, Commissioner Graham and I met with you. In the 2-hour conversation that ensued various matters were raised by you and discussed by us. At the end of the meeting you gave to Mr. Graham a letter dated May 26, asking some 21 questions, several of which had been discussed in our meeting. You asked that we answer in writing to you.

My first question was:

1. Why are the press and other informational mediums barred from Eniwetok for the whole Hardtack series with the exception of one shot? The top scientists and military men there assure me that there is nothing secret there outside of the boxes containing the devices themselves. There are ample facilities to accommodate 10 to 30 mediums' representatives. And people everywhere want to know and are entitled to know more about the purposes and conduct of these tests.

The AEC's answer is:

Your first question stated that top scientists and military men at the EPG assured you there was nothing secret there outside of the weapon boxes and that there were ample facilities to accommodate continuously 10 to 30 mediums' representatives and you asked why the press and other international mediums are not allowed to attend the whole Hardtack series.

I believe that you may have misunderstood the senior EPG personnel or they your questions. In our meeting we explained that there were many aspects of operation and much equipment beyond the nuclear devices themselves which are classified and that these are widespread throughout the proving ground. We pointed out that the course you propose would restrict to a high degree task force operations. The senior responsible task force personnel, military and civilian, agree with us in these regards. I understand you have had correspondence with the White House also concerning this matter and have received answers from Mr. Bryce Harlow. I believe, therefore, I need not cover this subject further.

My comment is: I did not misunderstand the senior Eniwetok Proving Ground personnel because it was this very matter of secrecy which caused my trip to the mid-Pacific. It is a little hard to believe that the instruments themselves are classified and it does seem to me that the value of demonstrating to the world that we are not reckless and aggressive, as our secrecy policies about these tests make us look, is grossly underrated.

My second question was:

2. What is the point of the Pinion operation? It seems to me a waste of time and money to show the 32 persons from all over the world something that has been demonstrated before and is not news, namely, that there is no immediate local fall-out from an airburst of a device in our possession. Most people remember the picture in Life some time ago showing the three Air Force officers standing directly under an air burst and doing so in perfect safety.

The AEC's answer is:

Your second question asks the reason for conducting the U. N. demonstration shot. There were plenty of good reasons for scheduling the demonstration shot, most of which we discussed with you in the Commission office, but I see no cause for extending this letter by reciting them since the cancellation of the demonstration shot, for equally good reasons, was announced on July 26, 1958.

My comments are: The fact is that the demonstration shot was canceled because too few of those invited believed that they would see anything to justify making the trip.

My third question was:

3. Chairman Strauss has on several occasions defended the present series of tests by asserting our need for a relatively clean

antimissile missile so radioactive debris won't fall back on us as we seek to defend ourselves. Is it not true and rather well known that a high altitude burst, even of a dirty device, has no local fallout?

The AEC's answer is:

Your third question states that former Chairman Strauss has on several occasions defended the Hardtack series by asserting our need for a relatively clean antimissile missile so that radioactive debris would not fall back on our people. You ask whether it is not true, and rather well known, that a high-altitude burst even of a dirty device has no local fallout. It is a well-known fact that a high-altitude burst generally will not give a heavy local fallout pattern, but this fact points to only one part of a complex problem. It is also true that the detonation of large numbers of shots at high altitude might contribute very significantly to fallout levels over very widespread areas including those near the firings. In the case of nuclear weapons used for defense against manned bombers, the problem has obvious implications. In all these regards very detailed information on the effects of firing under varied conditions is contained in the publicly issued handbook, *Effects of Nuclear Weapons—1957*. In the development of so-called clean weapons—weapons of low-fission yield, our objective is to design weapons whose firing would result in lesser residual contamination, both local and at a distance.

My comments are:

I can understand that clean defensive weapons are needed to prevent contamination not below the detonation but in the general area. However, it seems to me that whatever general fallout one would get would be trivial compared with that from an enemy attack. A concerted attack, I am informed, would involve approximately 1,000 megatons, most of which would be fission debris deposited locally. Moreover, I am informed that if there were a thousand 100 kiloton bombs, that is a total of 100 megatons, the fallout of 5 percent (rather high for high airbursts) would amount to only 5 megatons or less than that from a single nuclear weapon.

My fourth question was:

4. If the Hardtack series is, as there is reason to believe, relatively "clean," why cannot you announce the approximate total additions from these shots to the stratospheric reservoir? If it is less than 10 megatons, why not publicize this fact and show up the last Soviet test series?

The AEC's answer is:

Your fourth question concerning the cleanliness of Hardtack asks why we cannot announce the approximate total addition from these shots to the stratospheric reservoir. It is still the policy of the Commission to reveal such information only when information concerning our weapons design will not thereby be compromised.

My comment is: Does not the whole world have an interest in what we are doing to the world's atmosphere? And cannot we release this information in such a way as to prevent our enemies from checking on a particular test or weapon? You will note I only asked about the approximate total additions from these shots to the stratospheric reservoir.

My fifth question was:

5. Can't you be more explicit about the particular purposes of the Hardtack series and the priorities among the purposes? Cleanliness and peaceful applications are

given equal weight with smallness in previous statements, yet it seems clear this is not the case.

The AEC's answer is:

Your fifth question asks whether we cannot be more explicit about the purposes and priorities of the Hardtack series, commenting that in statements cleanliness and peaceful applications are given equal weight with smallness. Your sixth question asks why we do not separate shots for peaceful application from purely military shots, hold them underground, and invite U. N. participation. Commission statements have not indicated that a major purpose of the Hardtack series is the development of peaceful uses. All shots to be fired in the series, as you know, are designed to meet some specific defense requirement. In this regard you will note that the initial announcement of the Hardtack series (enclosure No. 1) and the announcement relative to the danger area dated February 14, 1958 (enclosure No. 2), pointed out that the objective of the series is the development of various types of weapons for defense against aggression. Both indicated that an important purpose also is the development of nuclear weapons of reduced radioactive fallout in relation to yield. The earlier announcement indicated, too, that the series would give information on the effects of weapons for military and civil-defense uses. There have been no firings to date of shots designed specifically to further nonmilitary applications, although much information valuable to nonmilitary use has been acquired incidentally from military firings. Byproduct peaceful uses of military devices are so normal that it would, indeed, be remarkable if nuclear developments did not compare in this respect with most other military systems. The underground Rainier firing of September 19, 1957, is an excellent example of this and an unclassified report thereon is attached as enclosure No. 3. It has been our intention to consider U. N. observance of any United States detonation for peaceful uses, as Dr. Libby has indicated publicly on several occasions. In this regard I am attaching as enclosure No. 4 a copy of an announcement of June 9, 1958, concerning a survey for a possible nuclear detonation harbor project. You will note that this specifically mentions our plan for U. N. participation if the harbor shot is fired. Though many interesting nonmilitary applications can be accomplished with underground containment, one such as the harbor excavation probably could not.

My comment is: The communications I had from AEC ranked peaceful purposes along with the development of defensive weapons and the development of clean weapons. I can only repeat that I believe the AEC has done a terrible job of public relations. This is tragic because of the importance of these policies in the field of international relationships. It would seem that the basic question is not whether additional tests are useful in a military sense but rather whether these tests are of more value to us or to the Russians if they continue to test.

My sixth question was:

6. Why not separate peaceful applications of nuclear devices from the purely military shots? Invite the UN to participate, hold them all underground, and make public everything but the devices in the black boxes themselves. (For AEC's answer see question 5.)

My comment is: It is quite clear that the AEC-DOD have no intention of relaxing secrecy on any aspect of the weapon. Project Plowshare is definitely

a classified activity, yet it has such great potentiality for good public relations arising from our development of nuclear explosions for constructive peaceful purposes.

My seventh question was:

7. Why not announce more details about the tests now being conducted and announce every shot? At present the one sentence announcement is meaningless except that it stirs the public to wonder what actually is happening and how many other shots have been completed without disclosure.

The AEC's answer is:

Your seventh question asks why we do not announce more details concerning tests being conducted, and announce every shot. As has been explained to you orally, we believe such course would have considerably greater advantage to the Soviets than to ourselves.

My comment is: It is not clear to me what advantage the Soviets do gain. Why for example has the AEC not even revealed the number of shots in the Castle and Red Wing Operations?

My eighth question was:

8. Why can't the AEC issue more information about "clean" bombs? It is not exactly a secret that superbombs derive their energy from the fission of U-238 and yet the AEC has not admitted this over a 4-year period.

The AEC's answer is:

Your eighth question asks why the AEC cannot give more information about "clean" bombs and comments that the AEC has not admitted over a 4-year period the importance of fission to the yield of superbombs. The details of design of the "clean" weapon, like that of all atomic weapons, are restricted data and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 rightfully forbids public dissemination. It is the Commission's policy to make public as much information as can be released safely and legally concerning this and other types of weapons. As to the importance of fission in a thermonuclear weapon, your attention is invited to the handbook, "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons—1957" pages 5 and 17. The handbook also gives detailed information on the patterns of fallout from various weapons. On page 421 it explains how these patterns vary as the percent of fission yield varies. Your attention is also invited to enclosure No. 5, which is a copy of certain testimony released by the JCAE Special Subcommittee on Radiation. On pages 73, 74, 79 and 80 thereof there are statements as to the manner in which the so-called "clean" weapon varies from a standard design. Much additional pertinent information is contained in the record of the JCAE's June 1957 fallout hearings.

My comment is: Pages 5 and 17 of the reference cited refer to the fission-fusion in nuclear weapons and imply that fusion neutrons are useful for uranium fission, but no mention is made of the utilization of U-238 as a fissionable substance. Page 73 of the second reference is that of Dr. Graves' testimony before the Holifield committee. This is a blind alley because Graves says he would prefer to discuss it in a closed session. On page 74 Graves says you can have "cleaner" but not "clean" bombs.

My ninth question was:

9. Why should not we quit testing, on a multilateral basis, since presumably we are ahead of the Soviet Union, having a 4-year lead in testing and having tested more than twice as many bombs as they have?

The AEC's answer is:

Your questions 9, 10, and 11 all concern the matter of justification for continued

testing. I believe the best brief statement of our beliefs in this regard are contained in our comment upon your proposed legislation, H. R. 8269. I am attaching as enclosure No. 6 a copy of that comment.

My comment is: My comments have been made before in the RECORD with respect to this report so I shall not repeat them now.

My 10th question was:

10. Does testing for better military weapons ever end? Are we not seeking perfection endlessly? It is public knowledge that the Armed Forces have atomic artillery of various calibre, depth charges, air to air, ground to air, and air to ground nuclear warheads for missiles. Will the need for more "sophisticated" weapons ever be satisfied? (For AEC's answer see question 9.)

My 11th question was:

11. Do we not have enough nuclear warheads and the means of delivering them right now to deter any intentional attack? (For AEC's answer see question 9.)

My 12th question was:

12. Since the inception of the H-bomb, what "safe rate of annual testing" meaning megatons of fission debris per year has the AEC used in its test program? How was this safe level agreed upon within the AEC and when was the first "safe level" solicited by the Commission from its technical advisors?

The AEC's answer was:

Your 12th question concerns the safe rate of annual testing used by the AEC. A statement of national policy in this regard is contained in annex II of the Bermuda communique issued after the March 1957 meeting between the President and the Prime Minister. The communique is attached as enclosure No. 7.

My comment is: The Bermuda communique is a vague generality and defines no safe level. This is a matter of public health. The AEC should reveal what its standards are.

My 13th question was:

13. When did the AEC receive a military specification for a clean bomb?

The AEC's answer was:

Your 13th question asks when the AEC received a military specification for a "clean" bomb. The Department of Defense expressed interest in such weapons several years ago. Beyond this I am not free in an unclassified letter to discuss Department of Defense requirements submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission.

My comment is: An expression of "interest" by the DOD several years ago is pretty flimsy. This is not a specification of military requirements. It looks as though classification here is used as a coverup.

My 14th question was:

14. Have the natives of Rongelap and other Marshall Islands sought compensation for radiation injuries received as a result of United States bomb tests? Has any compensation been granted?

The AEC's answer was:

Your 14th question asks whether the Rongelapese or other Marshall Islands have sought and received compensation for radiation injuries. They have not filed a claim and have not received a compensation as a result of a legal claim. However, through the United States Government they were given care, resettled in a newly built location and provided livestock.

My comment is: A serious moral question is involved here, one which has worldwide implications. How do you adequately and justly compensate people for such injuries? However, I must say that this answer is direct, which is more than I can say for the preceding 13.

My 15th question was:

15. Is it possible to test a nuclear weapon in space with a high degree of safety? What about the flash?

The AEC's answer was:

Your 15th question concerns the phenomena of nuclear detonation in space. Adequate answer to the question as phrased cannot be given without a discussion of information which would be of benefit to the Soviets. We would be happy to discuss this in a closed meeting at any time.

My comment is: I cannot understand why this must be classified and I intend to find out in the closed meeting suggested. What is involved here is a straight weapons effect. Since defense weapons would be used over the United States the public has a right to this information. The old dodge that this data would help the Russians is silly. It is a weapons effect and if the Russians do not know it already, they can find out very easily from their work unless, of course, they need to test to find this out. By our not telling what the data are, we invite the Russians to continue their tests. The AEC record on release of weapons effects is one of tardy information. Example: The first book on atomic weapons effects came out 5 years after Hiroshima. The second book on thermonuclear weapons came out almost 5 years after the Mike Shot.

My 16th question was:

16. If missiles are armed with nuclear warheads for intercepting ICBMs would a nuclear explosion result if these missiles aborted in takeoff or if they plunged to earth?

The AEC's answer was:

Your 16th question concerns the possibility that an antimissile missile might detonate on the ground if it aborted. As has been explained to you, every effort is made in the design of all our nuclear weapons to insure against accidental detonation.

My comment is: Because new versions of Nike will be tipped with nuclear warheads, this is a very important question. The public is entitled to a better answer than Mr. Floberg's vague generality.

My 17th question was:

17. AEC spokesmen have repeatedly asserted that the United States is far ahead of the Soviets in nuclear weapons. Upon what type of evidence is this assertion based? Estimates of Soviet capability—including the date of their first A-bomb and first H-bomb—have been badly in error.

The AEC's answer is:

Your 17th question asks upon what type of evidence do we base our estimates of the Soviet's nuclear weapons capability. For reasons known to you it is not possible in an unclassified document to comment on this matter.

My comment is: I do not ask for sources or methods, which obviously must be kept secret, but only for the type of evidence on which we base our estimates.

My 18th question was:

18. Since the AEC is charged by law with responsibility for carrying out weapon development, including testing, would it not be desirable for some other agency of the Government to appraise the radiation hazards from test programs?

The AEC's answer is:

Your 18th question concerns the advisability of some agency of Government other than the AEC making an appraisal of the radiation hazards from test programs. In this regard the National Academy of Sciences, on the suggestion of the AEC, conducted an investigation of all effects of radiation on man. Its report is entitled "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation." Its findings also were confirmed by the British Medical Research Council in a report issued at the same time. Its report is entitled "The Hazards to Man of Nuclear and Allied Radiations." Copies of these reports are attached as Enclosures Nos. 8, 9, 10. I believe it is important to note that these reports lean heavily on information developed by the AEC and were highly complimentary of the thoroughness of AEC's work in the radiation field. The AEC has considered from the beginning that it must analyze continually the health and safety aspects of all its activities and has conducted very extensive surveys, analyses, and studies over the years. We are always appreciative, however, of any authoritative effort undertaken by another agency to assist us in these matters. As you well know, the United Nations had a special committee of technical experts study this same problem; its recent report confirmed the previous studies referred to above.

My comment is: The NAS study was done after the events had taken place. The U. N. has made no attempt to define safety limits. The question here is whether some other agency ought to monitor the AEC's procedures as they relate to public health and safety. In my opinion the Public Health Service should be given this responsibility.

My 19th question was:

19. In view of Soviet technical achievements, including Sputnik III, would it not be wise to reappraise our policy of secrecy in scientific development? Is it not possible that we are hurting ourselves with too much secrecy?

The AEC's answer is:

Your 19th question concerns the advisability of reappraising our policy of secrecy in view of Sputnik III. It has been AEC's policy to appraise continually the information it retains classified and to declassify rapidly such information when it need no longer be retained as classified. In this regard the AEC declassified 21,809 documents in 1957 and an additional 12,541 in 1958 through May 31.

My comment is: This is the old numbers game. It would make more sense if the AEC would reveal how many reports are generated each year and how many are classified. How long does a document stay classified? Why are such areas as fusion power, project plowshare and some aspects of biology and medicine still classified?

My 20th question was:

20. Would the AEC agree to Senator Anderson's proposal that we halt "the testing of nuclear weapons of more than one megaton intensity"?

The AEC's answer is:

Your 20th question concerns the AEC's opinion on the halting of all tests of more

than a megaton. Again, I believe our opinion relative to any test cessation is best expressed by our comment on your proposed legislation, H. R. 8269, which is attached as enclosure No. 6.

My comment is: There are many ways to cut down the great harm from continued testing but apparently the AEC is determined to recognize none.

My 21st question was:

21. The assertion has been made that if we agreed to cease testing qualified scientists could not be retained at the Los Alamos Laboratory. Has any poll been taken of these scientists which substantiates this contention? Would not these scientists stay on the job if granted freedom to pursue unclassified and publishable scientific work?

The AEC's answer is:

Your 21st question asks if any poll has been taken to determine whether our laboratory personnel would leave the laboratories in case of a test cessation and whether they could not be retained if allowed to pursue other work. No poll has been taken in this regard, nor does a poll seem to me to be a sound technique for attacking such a problem as this. The laboratory directors and their senior-staff members have asserted repeatedly that such a cessation would lead the laboratory personnel to seek fields of work other than those connected with weapons development. We believe that most would stay if extensive and important nonmilitary work were carried on at the laboratories. The effect in either case, however, would be an interruption of further development in the nuclear-weapons field.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. FLOBERG,
Commissioner.

My comment is: I still think a poll would be the scientific way to proceed to obtain necessary facts as to the states of mind held by laboratory personnel. Why speculate? Why accept repeated assertions of laboratory directors and senior-staff members when the facts themselves can be ascertained?

My final comments are: There is no space to include the references cited in Mr. Floberg's letter but they are obtainable upon request from the AEC.

I am disappointed in the answer I received to my questions. It seems to me that the AEC could have answered them, without in any way endangering national security, more specifically and fully. I intend to continue my efforts to determine whether the AEC's secrecy mania can, with profit to all, be replaced by a more sensible policy.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SHIPPING BUILD-AND-TRADE-OUT INVESTIGATION

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1957, I brought to the attention of the House a multimillion dollar maritime giveaway and tax windfall to the Onassis shipping interests. A brief summary of what has taken place in regard to this matter up to the present time is in order.

At that time it was pointed out that a so-called trust, placing the Onassis vessels in the hands of his two minor American children, did not afford proper protection for the interests of the American people. This trust had been the result of a settlement of civil and criminal charges against the Greek shipowner and was supposed to be forever secure in American hands.

I charged that this trust was so loop-holed, that in effect, Mr. Onassis would still be in virtual control of his vessels. It was charged further, that the trust was not irrevocable and that there were a number of devices in it by which he could again obtain actual control of his vessels; that this transaction would actually create unemployment; and that it would cause the loss of over 500 jobs to American seamen.

At the same time I charged that this was a tremendous tax windfall, that the Government would lose millions of dollars in income tax, not only from the operation of the Onassis ships but from the income tax loss on jobs of American employees. Also, that the vessels were being transferred in such a way and for such giveaway prices, that tremendous additional tax advantage would accrue to the companies. Grave doubt was expressed that the contract between the Onassis interests and the Government would ever be fulfilled; that is, the contract to build three new supertankers to fly the American flag in exchange for the transfer of 14 United States ships to foreign ownership.

By reason of these charges the House Merchant Marine Committee conducted extensive hearings in March and April of 1957.

As a result of the hearings, the charges of tax windfall, creation of maritime unemployment and unusual favored treatment for the Onassis interests were clearly and overwhelmingly proved.

The committee was assured by the Maritime Administrator that the contract and the trust would be tightened up wherever possible to assure the building of the new American ships.

I do not wish to take the time of the House to detail the testimony. I recommend for your reading a copy of the hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, entitled "Study of Vessel Transfer, Trade-in, and Reserve Fleet Policies, Part I." However, some pertinent parts of the testimony before the committee are important enough to discuss now.

It was found that the so-called trust was based upon the settlement of the criminal and civil cases against Onassis and his associates. Although the civil case had been settled for about \$7 million in penalties, at the time of the settlement there was no mention made to the court that this trust was to be created.

Subsequently, the Department of Justice, together with the Onassis lawyers, drew this trust agreement. It was unusual in many respects, particularly in that it provided elements of the ship transfer to foreign flag, the tax windfall advantages, and all of the other emoluments and favored treatment

which have been subsequently received by Onassis.

This trust, instead of penalizing the Onassis interests, was set up in such a way by the two departments of Government involved, that is, the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce, that it not only vitiated the effect of the penalty of the court settlement but has provided means by which it is easier not only for Onassis to pay his penalty but make substantial profits thereon.

Further, no bond was required for the building of the new American vessels by the Onassis interests. In other words, all that remained for the Government was a lawsuit.

At the conclusion of the 1957 hearings, fears were expressed by members of the committee that once the Onassis interests were permitted to proceed with the terms of the trust, that they would not comply with the requirement to build the American ships.

On April 15, 1958, these fears, unfortunately, were realized. The Onassis interests sent a letter to the Maritime Administration indicating that they were canceling the contract; that they would not proceed with the building of the American ships and were ready to take the matter to court.

The hearings on this subject were resumed before a special subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee with the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Honorable HERBERT BANNER, serving as chairman of the subcommittee. Just before the commencement of the new hearings, at the request of the Maritime Administrator, the Department of Justice began a law suit for the collection of the \$8 million damages from Onassis.

The new hearings, which began in June of this year, have revealed some startling and shocking facts. I suggest to my colleagues that when these hearings are printed in full they be the subject of intensive study. Among other things we found that although over \$20 million have been collected by the Onassis trust for the purpose of building American ships, there was only about \$750,000 in the fund. All of the money collected has gone to the payment of all the old debts and back taxes which had been due and owing by Onassis to the Government and creditors for periods prior to the settlement of his cases in court for periods back to 1948. Legal fees and salaries have taken almost a million dollars. For example, the chief executive of the operation although receiving approximately \$35,000 yearly for his salary, does this work only as a part-time occupation.

Among some of the old Onassis debts which were being paid by the trust were some mortgages owing to one of America's largest life-insurance companies. It was testified that another disbursement has occurred by the \$10,000 yearly salary paid to the son of a high official of this life-insurance company. The duties of this man apparently are merely to see that payments are made to the insurance company. It was further brought out that a \$5,000 yearly salary is paid by the operating company to the trust officer of

the trustee bank. His duties for the company were not made clear.

There was no indication at the time of the 1957 hearings that moneys collected which were to be used for building American ships were to be disbursed in such large amounts or for the purposes above indicated. Witnesses had testified that there were about three or four million dollars due and owing for back debts and taxes. I am sure that if the committee had any notice whatsoever that all the \$20 million was to be used for these purposes, immediate steps would have been taken to protect the interests of the American people by adequate legislation.

Although this trust is supposed to be under American control, the testimony shows that very little, if anything, is done without the presence or approval of Mr. Onassis, who is not an American citizen, and the inescapable conclusion has been reached that he has tacit if not actual control even at the present time.

Evidence has been adduced that further great advantage has been given to him, for even in the payment of his old debts, amounting to millions of dollars, under the setup of the trust he is obligated to pay only 25 percent of the debts instead of 49 percent, as he would have if the trust had not been created. This alone has amounted, during the past year, to a giveaway to him of about \$5 million.

Throughout the hearings, both in 1957 before the full committee and before the subcommittee this year, the participation of the Department of Justice in this maritime transaction was of great interest.

It having been testified that the trust agreement was based upon the civil and criminal cases, the committee went into the Department of Justice activities in this case.

Mr. Onassis, testifying under oath, said that back in 1948, long before he had been indicted, after being unable to procure some of the surplus Government tankers involved, he had gone to the law firm of Lord, Day & Lord. At that time, one of the senior partners was Herbert Brownell, Jr. Mr. Onassis testified that he had paid "fancy prices" for legal advice and services to acquire and procure these surplus vessels. That subsequently, acting on that advice and services, these vessels were acquired. This transaction was the subject of the civil and criminal cases instituted against him by the Government in 1953. However, they had long been under investigation by the prior administration of President Truman. Mr. Onassis testified that he had been indicted in 1953 by the Department of Justice, headed by the then Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, Jr., the very person whose law firm had acted as his attorneys in the transaction, and that he had been indicted upon the precise matter for which he had paid them the "fancy prices".

Mr. Onassis then testified that he had "ransomed" himself by discussing in person, in numerous interviews with Assistant Attorney General Burger and other officials in the Department of Justice,

the settlement of his civil cases and the dismissal of the criminal charges against him. He repeatedly stated that the only reason for his agreeing to settle the civil case and to pay about \$7 million in penalties was to have the criminal charges against him dismissed.

As a result of the foregoing testimony, it became necessary, both in the interests of the investigation and out of courtesy to Mr. Brownell, to call him as a witness. He appeared, and in his sworn testimony he admitted that back in 1948 and 1949 he had shared in his law firm's fees which were received from Mr. Onassis, that he knew at all times who Mr. Onassis was. Although admitting this, Mr. Brownell denied that Mr. Onassis had been indicted for the same matter on which his law firm had represented Onassis. Upon being confronted with statements and bills rendered by his law firm, Mr. Brownell, nevertheless, repeatedly denied the truth of the Onassis testimony in this respect. When Mr. Brownell was questioned as to why, when acting as Attorney General in the Onassis matter, he had not disclosed his prior connection with Mr. Onassis, either his own version thereof or that of Onassis, he gave a most unusual answer. He stated that it would have been improper to disclose this prior connection, although he conceded that in a state of facts such as set forth by Onassis he would have required such disclosure both by himself or his subordinates.

This has resulted in a sharp and categorical conflict in the sworn testimony of Mr. Onassis and Mr. Brownell. Which one is telling the truth and which one has perjured himself should be the subject of investigation by the Department of Justice. Discrepancies in the sworn testimony of witnesses at Congressional hearings is not to be taken lightly, for it offends the dignity of the Congress and of the American people. It impedes our legislative duties.

Furthermore, if the testimony of Mr. Onassis is true and that of Mr. Brownell is in error, there are serious questions of conflict of interest and legal ethics involved. There was placed into the record of the hearing Canon Nos. 6 and 37 of the Code of Ethics of the American Bar Association. There have also been Federal court decisions on this subject. Leading cases are *In Re Boone* (83 Fed. 944), and *United States v. Bishop* (80 Fed. 2d 65). On the other hand, if the testimony of Mr. Brownell is accurate, then proper steps should be taken to have Mr. Onassis either rectify his testimony or he should be dealt with as the circumstances dictate.

Mr. Onassis gratuitously gave the committee testimony on a transaction similar to his involving other persons called the Kulukundis group. In that case the Kulukundis people had sometime in 1948 retained Mr. Brownell in person together with his law firm for advice and services on procuring ships such as those involved in the instant transaction. Subsequently, when Mr. Brownell became Attorney General, he had those people indicted for the ship transaction. They were brought to trial in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in a case entitled *United States*

against Philadelphia Marine. The case was tried in December 1954. During the course of the trial Mr. Brownell, who was then Attorney General and whose assistant was prosecuting the defendants, was subpoenaed as a witness on behalf of the defendants. At the trial he admitted his prior connection with the defendants and the work he had done for them before becoming Attorney General. The defendants were acquitted. Mr. Brownell's testimony at that trial, has been made part of the record of the hearings.

Mr. Onassis in his testimony repeatedly asserted that what he had done was on the advice of his lawyers. He stated that he had paid great sums of money for legal advice in order to be sure that what he was doing was proper.

Another amazing bit of the testimony developed during the course of the present hearings was that officials of the Onassis Company testified, that although they had by letter canceled the contract with the Government, the actual facts were to the contrary. That is, that they were proceeding with the building of the ships; that the letter of cancellation had been a mere pretext and a device to obtain further Congressional hearings on the subject. These officials testified that they had reason to believe that the Merchant Marine Committee would not interest itself in this subject again unless the Onassis interests were not fulfilling the contract. Knowing this, they conspired to draft this letter of cancellation with the thought they could reactivate the hearings and thus possibly modify the contract with Congressional approval.

However, the most startling evidence on this phase was still to come. All of these witnesses testified that the Maritime Administrator himself knew of their hoax in advance and as a matter of fact, that they had sent him a draft of their cancellation letter in advance for his approval and comment. They also testified that he knew that they had not canceled their building contracts and were proceeding with them.

The foregoing made it necessary to recall the Maritime Administrator. In his sworn testimony he denied that he knew of the hoax but admitted receiving a draft of the proposed cancellation letter. This has resulted in a square conflict of sworn testimony.

These discrepancies should also be the subject of scrutiny by the Department of Justice. These actions on the part of the Onassis group constitute a fraud on the Government. It was upon the letter of cancellation that the Maritime Administrator turned the case over to the Department of Justice, which even at present is suing for \$8 million liquidation damages on the contract. If the facts as testified by the Onassis interests are true, that is, that the ships are now building, then this lawsuit is a futile one and cannot be successfully concluded by the Government. Their nefarious scheme has caused this Congress irreparable loss of time, waste of effort, and substantial expenditures of committee funds in reactivating these hearings to attempt to secure for themselves some additional advantages in their contract.

Further probing into the settlement of the civil and criminal cases disclosed that on December 21, 1955, an attorney from the Department of Justice appeared before a Federal court and in substance stated it would be very difficult for the Government to prove its case against Onassis. He stated, in effect, that the case was a very weak one. Thereupon, the court was requested to dismiss the case against Onassis in person, and to subject some of his corporations to fines.

During the course of the hearings, the same Department attorney who had appeared before the court to dismiss the indictment against Onassis, and whose statement to the court at that time is a part of the record of these hearings, admitted that prior to December 21, 1955, he had drawn a memorandum on the merits of this case for his superiors in the Department of Justice. In the memorandum, which is a part of the record of the hearings, he reviewed all of the evidence and came to the following conclusion:

Proof of the foregoing facts will be established by a large mass of documents, consisting of maritime records, records of the companies, the banks, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and Simpson, Spence & Young, together with the testimony of persons connected with the companies, former employees thereof, Government officials, bank officials, employees of Simpson, Spence & Young, and the Central American Steamship Co., agents of the FBI, as well as the statements of Onassis and Berenson to investigators. Assuming all the proposed evidence is admitted, it will be clearly and definitely established that the defendant corporations could not have functioned without Onassis; that Onassis had actual as well as economic control over the companies, which he was permitted to exercise; that this control was not only contemplated and intended by the conspirators when Onassis was unable to get vessels directly, but carried out by them even to the present time when Onassis instituted negotiations with the Civil Division looking toward a settlement of the pending civil proceedings.

This opinion and the entire memorandum indicates that instead of a weak and unprovable case, the Government had a strong and indeed easily proven case of criminality against Onassis.

As a matter of fact, this very witness from the Department of Justice testified before the committee that he had always felt that the persons and corporations involved were guilty. Nevertheless, upon the direction and suggestion of his superior, he informed the court that the case was a weak one. He also testified that the court was not aware of all of the facts contained in his memorandum.

This dismissal of the criminal case against Onassis was part and parcel of the settlement of the civil case and indeed, one neatly tied package. It was admitted in the 1957 hearings by a high official of the Department of Justice that the so-called deal which had been suggested by one of the Onassis attorneys at the inception of the litigations was in effect what had been achieved by the court settlement in 1955.

It was further brought out from the departmental memorandum of the same witness that there was evidence that one

of the persons involved in the Onassis transactions sometime between 1948 and 1953 had embezzled \$500,000, that he had never been charged therewith, and not even prosecuted. This witness testified that nothing has been done about it to the present time. Upon being questioned as to failure to act, he testified that in his opinion it was not a Federal matter. However, in view of the fact that some of the funds collected during the past year were disbursed for the payment of past debts, Federal taxes, and obligations instead of being available for the building of the ships, it seems that this question of the embezzlement of a half million dollars is most certainly something that the Government should be concerned with.

The foregoing is merely a sampling of the facts and testimony before the committee. The entire transaction is a most complex one. In fact, the complexity has all but obscured the shocking aspects of the transaction and the detrimental effect upon the American Merchant Marine, American labor, the American maritime industry, and the American economy. To say that the Onassis interests have merely been coincidentally fortunate in their transactions with the Government is to disregard the inescapable conclusion and the fair inferences from the testimony before the committee.

I have no doubt that in the wisdom of the committee it will take whatever steps are necessary to rectify legislatively and otherwise, the inequities and the abuses indicated by this entire transaction.

As the hearings on this particular subject draw to a close, I wish to indicate that months of study have revealed another set of transactions in which the so-called Niarchos interests are involved, and which practically parallel the course taken by that of Onassis. On what is known of the Niarchos cases so far it may well be that the facts when revealed will show greater abuses than those in the instant situation.

In any event, some results have been forthcoming, albeit somewhat late, on the part of the Maritime Administration. It has just recently instituted a policy of escrow arrangement on funds collected on those build-and-trade-out transactions to assure the building of American-flag ships.

From this summary of some of the highlights of the testimony adduced during the hearings before this committee, it is evident that the next Congress will enact much needed remedial legislation to prevent the depletion of the American Merchant Marine, to prevent million dollar tax favoritism, to prevent unemployment among American seamen, and to in other ways promote and protect the American flag on the high seas.

In conclusion, I wish to compliment the great chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, for his exemplary and outstandingly fair and thorough conduct of these hearings. Each and every witness was given full opportunity to be heard and most of them expressed their appreciation for their treatment.

The diligent and learned counsels of the committee, John Drewry, Esq., Ber-

nard Zincke, Esq., and Robert Cowan, Esq., deserve the commendation and thanks of the House for their great work in this inquiry.

BOATING INDUSTRY

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 519, which was passed by this body during the 84th Congress, has created a great deal of concern in the boating industry, which is a very important and major segment of our gulf coast economy.

The intent of Congress in passing this law was to insure safety at sea through a program of inspection and certification of all boats carrying more than six passengers. We all agree, especially those in the boating industry, that this program could be constructive and beneficial to all; however, the major objections to this law have not been on the basis of the act itself but on the regulations set up by the Coast Guard under the authority given to it by the act.

The boating industry has, of course, voiced its appeal to the Congress and in essence has said that the regulations impose a tremendous financial burden to the owners and operators in this industry, which is basically a one-man operation in a highly competitive field; that the features of the regulations would not insure safety at sea, as these provisions are covered by previous law; that the provisions of this law were imposed without the consent of the majority of the members of the boating industry; that the regulations are far too complicated and wordy in language to be understood and comprehended by the members of the boating industry; and that the regulations would deny due process of law.

On numerous occasions I have discussed these points with the Coast Guard, and on each occasion I have been assured that the Coast Guard is in sympathy with the boating industry and that it has done, and will continue to do, everything it can to make this law operate in the manner in which Congress intended for it to be carried out.

Public Law 519 was to go into effect on January 1, 1958, but at the urging of Congress its enactment was postponed until June 1, 1958. This inspection program has now been in operation for a little more than 2 months, which is much too early to determine its effectiveness or its reception by the owners and operators of small boats; however, I, along with many of my colleagues, have urged the Coast Guard to show moderation in this program, and I have requested the Coast Guard to keep me constantly informed of its progress. If the questions that have been voiced by the boating industry do develop, then I expect to urge that at the earliest possible time in the 86th Congress, this law be amended, or if necessary repealed, so

that new legislation can be put into its place which would enable our boating industry to live with and to understand this form of regulation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, August 20, 1958, on account of birth of daughter in his family.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana, for August 20 and 21, on account of official business.

Mr. HOSMER, for 6 days, on account of official business of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McDONOUGH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN), for 30 minutes, on August 22.

Mr. McDONOUGH, for 60 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HERLONG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. BROOMFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. BURLISON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PORTER and to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD following the legislative business of today and to include extraneous matter therein.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

At the request of Mr. ALBERT, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and to in-

clude extraneous matter in each instance as follows:

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend remarks he made today in the House and to include therein extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7125. An act to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 540. An act for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 552. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.;

S. 571. An act for the relief of George P. E. Caesar, Jr.;

S. 765. An act to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.;

S. 1542. An act for the relief of Lori Biagi;

S. 2001. An act for the relief of Alalu Duncan Dillard;

S. 2043. An act for the relief of Genoveffa Migliozi;

S. 2057. An act for the relief of Diana Elaine Greig;

S. 2216. An act for the relief of John C. Walsh;

S. 2517. An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes with respect to certain lands granted to States and Territories for public purposes;

S. 2530. An act to designate the beneficiary of the equitable title to land purchased by the United States and added to the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, Montana;

S. 2592. An act to amend the law relating to the execution of contracts with Indian tribes;

S. 2594. An act to transfer certain property and functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 2850. An act for the relief of Maria Pontillo;

S. 2888. An act to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans;

S. 2922. An act to authorize per capita to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 2955. An act for the relief of Kazuko Young;

S. 3004. An act for the relief of Joanna Strutyńska;

S. 3139. An act to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

S. 3203. An act relating to minerals on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3219. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Graham Bonnalie;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Erika Margaretha Zintl Pearce;

S. 3300. An act for the relief of Jean Andre Paris;

S. 3308. An act for the relief of Itzhak Aronovici;

S. 3357. An act for the relief of Arturo Ernesto Audrain y Campos;

S. 3445. An act for the relief of Teruko K. Jackson;

S. 3448. An act to authorize the acquisition and disposition of certain private lands and the establishment of the size of farm units on the Seedskadee reclamation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3502. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 3509. An act for the relief of Wong Wing Bo;

S. 3534. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 181 acres of land at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo.;

S. 3547. An act for the relief of Andrejs Pablo Mierkalns;

S. 3564. An act to accord coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain temporary rural carriers;

S. 3572. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 3607. An act for the relief of Harvey L. Forden;

S. 3640. An act for the relief of Daniel (Nathaniel) Rosenzweig;

S. 3676. An act for the relief of Maria Michela Leo Di Giola;

S. 3682. An act to authorize the sale or exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Pima County, Ariz., and for other purposes;

S. 3723. An act to amend Public Law 522, 84th Congress (relating to the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Henderson, Nev.);

S. 3739. An act for the relief of Hermine Elmon Papazian;

S. 3743. An act for the relief of Cynthia Elizabeth Jefferson (Mimi Kurosaka) and Sylvia Elise Jefferson (Junko Tano);

S. 3768. An act for the relief of Hing Man Chau;

S. 3789. An act for the relief of Donald J. Marion;

S. 3801. An act for the relief of Klara Leitner and her daughter, Sylvia Leitner;

S. 3826. An act for the relief of Concettina Iannacchino;

S. 3873. An act to amend section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds;

S. 3882. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1948, chapter 791 (24 U. S. C., 279a), providing for the procurement and supply of Government headstones and markers;

S. 3921. An act for the relief of Peter Tillner;

S. 3986. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement for relocating portions of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Miss., and for other purposes;

S. 4004. An act to encourage and authorize details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations;

S. 4020. An act for the relief of Kunio Inouye (Sparkman);

S. 4021. An act to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins, and intervening areas;

S. 4053. An act to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 4071. An act to provide more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities;

S. 4081. An act for the relief of Marianne (Sachiko) Fuller;

S. 4167. An act to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes;

S. 4191. An act to maintain existing minimum postage rates on certain publications mailed for delivery within the county of publication;

S. 4196. An act to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (47 Stat. 1425), as amended, to authorize incorporation of contract terms by reference in short-form documents;

S. 4287. An act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, relating to detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 8-14, 1959, as National Children's Dental Health Week;

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to approve the report of the Department of the Interior on Red Willow Dam and Reservoir in Nebraska; and

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to authorize the chairman on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3904. An act for the relief of Nunik Firjanian and Florence Thomas;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Louis S. Levenson;

H. R. 6175. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell;

H. R. 6894. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings;

H. R. 8160. An act authorizing a survey of the Tensaw River, Ala., in the interest of navigation and allied purposes;

H. R. 8481. An act to amend title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide that the provisions of such title shall apply in Hawaii;

H. R. 8652. An act to rescind the authorization for the Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Willamette River, Oreg.;

H. R. 9239. An act to provide for the construction of an irrigation distribution system and drainage works for restricted Indian lands within the Coachella Valley County Water District in Riverside County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9371. An act to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10360. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended;

H. R. 11630. An act to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the unemployment insurance system to ex-servicemen, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11697. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits in the harbor of New York, to extend the application of that act to the harbor of Hampton Roads;

H. R. 12489. An act to extend the time for making certain reports under the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956;

H. R. 12494. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture in selling or agreeing to the sale of lands to the State of North Carolina to permit the State to sell or exchange such lands for private purposes;

H. R. 12876. An act to extend title VII of the Public Health Service Act (relating to health research facilities) for 3 years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13342. An act to provide for a survey of Parish Line Canal, La.;

H. R. 13558. An act to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, of combat-wounded veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart; and

H. R. 13688. An act to provide airmail and special-delivery postage stamps for Members of the House of Representatives on the basis of regular sessions of Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 21, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2251. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, relative to transmitting for the consideration of the Congress amendments to section 409 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 409 (c)); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2252. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subsection 432 (g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2253. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference H. R. 3368. A bill to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (Rept. No. 2678). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Fortieth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to Federal role in aviation (Rept. No. 2679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Forty-first report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to Internal Revenue Service (Rept. No. 2680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 56 pertaining to sightseeing businesses in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 13823. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before Congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 13824. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 13825. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to grant a right of possession in certain property in the District of Columbia to surviving widows, widowers, and minor children so long as such property is used as their principal place of residence; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 13826. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 13827. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new

program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 693. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the Compilation of Social Security Laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 13828. A bill for the relief of Pinkhas Argaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 13829. A bill for the relief of Leonard Zimmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 13830. A bill for the relief of Alfred E. Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 13831. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figuero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 13832. A bill for the relief of John F. Linehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 13833. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Castorina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 13834. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 13835. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

733. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Medical Society of the State of New York in opposition to enactment of the Forand bill (H. R. 9467); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

734. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county clerk of Maui, Walluku, Maui, T. H., relative to requesting and urging the Senate to approve H. R. 13070 in the form as passed by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Social Security Amendments of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 20, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1958, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1958 passed the Congress by an overwhelming majority

and now goes to the White House for the President's signature.

The immediate effect of these amendments will be felt in the monthly benefit checks of approximately 12 million Americans who are presently on the rolls of the social security system.

The more important changes made by Congress which will be highlighted in the benefit payments of the near future are: First, raise of the minimum to \$33 and the maximum to \$118 monthly for retired workers; second, raise the maximum to \$254 monthly for family groups; third, raise the eligible earning wage of

the retiree to \$100 monthly; fourth, ease the eligibility requirements for disability benefits resulting from gradual disabilities; fifth, ease the eligibility requirements for qualification as a family dependent; sixth, increase in the appropriations by \$5 million for each of the following: First, the maternal child health programs; second, the crippled children's services; and, third, the child welfare services.

To support these increases the social-security withholding tax was raised by one-fourth of 1 percent for employees